

A N

Yorke. b. 58

EXPOSITION
OF THE
CREED.

B Y

JOHN PEARSON D D. Margaret Professor
at CAMBRIDGE, and
Chaplain to his MAJESTY.

The second Edition, Revised and Enlarged.



L O N D O N,

Printed for JOHN WILLIAMS at the sign of the *Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-yard. 1662.

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

53-109

To the Right Worshipfull and Well-beloved the, Parishioners of

S^t. C L E M E N T S

E A S T - C H E A P E.

Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplyed.

IF I should be at any time unmindfull of your commands, you might well esteem me unworthy of your continued favours; & there is some reason to suspect I have incurred the interpretation of forgetfulness, having been so backward in the performance of my promises. Some years have passed since I preached unto you upon such Texts of Scripture as were on purpose selected in relation to the C R E E D, and was moved by you to make those meditations publick. But you were pleased then to grant what my inclinations rather led me to, that they might be turned into an Exposition of the C R E E D it self: which partly by the difficulty of the Work undertaken, partly by the intervention of some other imployments, hath taken me up thus long, for which I desire your pardon. And yet an happy excuse may be pleaded for my delay, meeting with a very great felicity, that as Faith triumpheth in good works, so my Exposition of the Creed should be contemporary with the reedifying of your Church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my Book should last so long as that Fabrick; yet I am exceedingly pleased that they should begin together; that the publishing of the one should so agree with the opening of the other. This I hope may perswade you to forget my slackness, considering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells you the excuse of Church-work will be accepted in building, I beseech you let it not be denied in printing.

That blessed Saint, by whose name your Parish is known, was a fellow-labourer with S^t. Paul, and a successor of S^t. Peter; he had the honour to be numbred in the Scripture with them whose names are written in the book of life, and when he had sealed the Gospel with his blood, he was one of the first whose memory was perpetuated by the building a Church to bear his name. Thus was S^t. Clement's Church famous in Rome, when Rome was famous for the faith spoken of throughout the whole world. He wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians infested with a schisme, in imitation of S^t. Paul, which obtained so great authority in the

The Epistle E D I C A T O R Y.

Primitive times, that it was frequently read in their publick Congregations; and yet had for many hundred years been lost, till it was at last set forth out of the Library of the late King.

Now as by the providence of God, the memory of that Primitive Saint hath been restored in our age, so my design aimeth at nothing else but that the Primitive Faith may be revived. And therefore in this Edition of the Creed I shall speak to you but what St. Iude hath already spoken to the whole Church, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needfull for me to write unto you, that ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints.* If it were so needfull for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the first Faith, it will appear as needfull for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earnestnesse, because the reason which he renders as the cause of that necessity is now more prevalent then it was at that time or ever since. *For, saith he, there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Iesus Christ.* The Principles of Christianity are now as freely question'd as the most doubtful and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as safely denied, as the most unnecessary superstructions; that Religion hath the greatest advantage which appeareth in the newest dress, as if we looked for another Faith to be delivered to the Saints. Whereas in Christianity there can be no concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new is certainly false. Look then for purity in the fountain, & strive to embrace the first Faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide then the Creed, received in all ages of the Church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while *those which are unskilful & unstable wrest the words of God himself unto their own damnation,* ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulness, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability; w^{ch} as it hath been the constant endeavour, so shall it ever be the prayer of him who after so many encouragements of his labours amongst you, doth still desire to be known as

Your most faithfull servant in the Lord

JOHN PEARSON.



TO THE
R E A D E R.



Have in this Book undertaken an Exposition of the CREED, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief Account of the Work: least any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed without controversie is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian Faith, and is generally taken to contain all things necessary² to be³ believed. Now whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not ~~the~~ ^{an} Expositor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to enquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equall and absolute necessity, we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient, as to the design of an Exposition, to interpret the words, and so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth; how far, and in what degree, and to what purposes it is necessary.

This therefore is the Method which I proposed to my self, and have prosecuted in every Article. First, to settle the words of each Article according to their Antiquity and Generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the Terms, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same. Thirdly, to shew what are those truths which are naturally contained in those terms so explicated, and to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly, to declare what is the Necessity of believing those truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul and upon the life of a believer. Lastly, by a recollection of all, briefly to deliver the summe of every particular truth, so that every one when he pronounceth the Creed may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to professe, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the Whole according to this Method I have considered that a Work of so generall a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of Readers, which though they may agree in judgement, yet must differ much in their capacities. Some there are who understand the Original Languages of
the

To the READER.

the Holy Scripture, the discourses and Tractates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and History of the Church of God, the constant profession of sealed truths, the rise and encrease of Schismes and Heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and incapable of such instructions: who understand the Scriptures as they are translated: who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence: who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto them out of the word of God, and in the language which they know. When I make this difference, and distinction of Readers: I do not intend thereby that, because one of these is Learned, the other is Ignorant; for he which hath no skill of the learned languages, may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of Christian religion, and the reason and efficacy of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my exposition, so that the Body of it containeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language, by which he which is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected onely such notions as are common, easie, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most materiall conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprize the whole strength of the Work, as far as it is possible, in the Body of it. The other Part I have placed in the Margin, (but so as oftentimes it taketh up more room, and yet is never mingled or confounded with the rest,) in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed, as to them which have any knowledge of the Latine, Greek, and Originall Languages, of the writings of the ancient Fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the History of the Church, those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian Religion.

Now being the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our Religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a religion, and those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in Naturall Theology, such as no man which worshippeth a God can deny, and therefore in the proof of these I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the Atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a religion to be professed. As it is our Religion, it is Christian and Catholick: as Christian, it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I shew out of the Law and the Prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our Religion is Catholick, it holdeth fast that faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities in opposition to the Hereticks arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the Articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new Body of Divinity in opposition

To the READER.

opposition to the Catholick Theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is upon the word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alledged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason: not urging the Authority of the Church which they reject, but onely giving in the Margine the sense of the Primitive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for Antiquity, and are perswaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.

In that part which after the demonstration of each Truth teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian; I have not thought fit to expatiate or inlarge my self, but onely to mention such effects as flow naturally and immediately from the doctrine, especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and perspicuity. And indeed in the whole work, as I have laid the foundation upon the Written Word of God, so I have with much diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to each Doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as they lie in the writings of those holy pen-men; not referring the Reader to places named in the Margine, (which too often I find in many books multiplied to little purpose) but producing and interweaving the sentences of Scripture into the body of my Exposition, so that the Reader may understand the strength of all my reason without any further enquiry or consultation. For if those words which I have produced, prove not what I have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the places named to maintain it.

At the Conclusion of every distinct and full Notion, I have recollected briefly and plainly the summe of what hath been delivered in the explication of it, and put it, as it were, into the mouth of every Christian, thereby to expresse more fully his faith, and to declare his profession. So that if the Reader please to put those Collections together, he may at once see and perceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this publick, ancient and Orthodox Confession of Faith.

I have nothing more to adde, but onely to pray that the Lord would give you and me a good understanding in all things.

T H E

THE
C R E E D.

B*elieve in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; & in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholick Church, the communion of Saints, the forgivenesse of sins, the Resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.*



AN EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

ARTICLE I.

*I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of
Heaven and Earth.*



S the first word *Credo, I believe*, giveth a denomination to the whole confession of Faith, from thence commonly call'd the *CREED*; so is the same word to be imagin'd not to stand only where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the Confession. For although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefix'd to the head of every Article: that as we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, so we are also understood to say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his onely Son, our Lord*; as, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, so also, *I believe the Catholick Church*. Neither is it to be joyned with every compleat Article only; but where any Article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be looked upon as affix'd to every part, or single truth, contained in that Article: as, for example, in the first, *I believe in God, I believe that God to be the Father, I believe that Father to be Almighty, I believe that Father Almighty to be the Maker of Heaven and Earth*. So that this *Credo, I believe*, rightly considered, multiplieth it self to no lesse then a double number of the Articles, and will be found at least 24. times contained in the *CREED*. Wherefore being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our Confession of Faith, that without it we can neither have *CREED* nor Confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many and so various Truths.

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAPS

A

Now

to him credible, and that as 'tis credible; and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible as 'tis credible, believeth something by so assenting: which is sufficient to shew the definition compleat.

But for the explication of the same, further observations will be necessary. For if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the credibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be *Credible*, and in what *Credibility* doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of *Belief*.

Now that is properly *Credible* which is not apparent of itself, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reverfely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these wayes, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves, are either so in respect of our sense, as that snow is white, and fire is hot; or in respect of our understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater then any one part of the whole; that, every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kind of which being propounded to our sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed *Credible*, but *evident* to sense; as the latter kind propounded to the understanding, are immediately embraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called *Credible*, but *evident* to the understanding. And so those things which are * apparent, are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

Again, other things, though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connexion with something formerly known. For being every natural cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own natural effect, and every natural effect wholly dependeth upon, and absolutely presupposeth, its own proper cause, therefore there must be an immediate connexion between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows that if the connexion be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these waies proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in Mathematicks, and conclusions in other Sciences; which propositions and conclusions are not said to be *Credible*, but *Scientificall*; and the comprehension of them, is not *Faith*, but *Science*.

Besides, some things there are which, though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessarie connexion to their causes or effects, notwithstanding appear to most as true, by some external relations to other truths; but yet so, as the appearing truth still leaves a possibilitie of falsehood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an *Assent*. In which case whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon real Arguments, is not yet call'd *Credible*, but *Probable*: and an Assent to such a Truth, is not properly *Faith*, but *Opinion*.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding in and of it self, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessarie connexion with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any real Arguments or relations to other acknowledged Truths, and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of it self, but by virtue of the testimonie given to it;

* Apparentia non habent fidem sed agnitionem. Greg. 4. Dial. cap. 5. Habet Fides oculos suos quibus quodammodo videt verum esse quod nondum videt, & quibus certissime videt nondum se videre quod credit. S. August. Ep. 222.

this is said properly to be *Credible*; and an *Assent* unto this, upon such *Credibility*, is in the proper notion, *Faith* or *Belief*.

Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of *Faith* in general, so far as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever; our method will lead us on to descend by way of division to the several kinds thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of *Faith* in the Christians *Confession*, the design of our present disquisition. And being we have placed the formality of the Object of all belief in *Credibility*, it will clearly follow that diversity of *Credibility* in the Object will proportionably cause a distinction of *Assent* in the Understanding, and consequently a several kind of *Faith*, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an *Assent*.

Now the *Credibility* of objects, by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different *Authority* of the *Testimony* on which it depends. For we having no other certain means of assuring our selves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our *Assent* in matters of mere *Belief*, then the *Testimony* upon which we believe; if there be any fundamental distinction in the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, it will cause the like difference in the *Assent*, which must needs bear a proportion to the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider in what the *Authority* of a *Testimony* consisteth, and so to descend to the several kinds of *Testimonies* founded upon several *Authorities*.

The strength and validity of every *Testimony* must bear proportion with the *Authority* of the *Testifier*: and the *Authority* of the *Testifier* is founded upon his *Ability* and *Integrity*: his *Ability* in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserteth, his *Integrity* in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. For two several wayes he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth which in it self is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithful, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these waies, for want either of *Ability* or *Integrity* in the *Testifier*, who so grounds his *Assent* unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so *Able* as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so faithfull as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived, so deceiveth no man. So far therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, and to be faithful in the relation of what he knows, so far his testimony is acceptable, so far that which he testifieth is properly *Credible*: and thus the *Authority* of every *Testifier* or relatour is grounded upon these two foundations, his *Ability* and *Integrity*.

Now there is in this case, so far as it concerns our present design, * a double *Testimony*: the *Testimony* of man to man, relying upon humane authority; and the *Testimony* of God to man, founded upon divine authority: which two kinds of *Testimony* are respective grounds of two kinds of *Credibility*, *Humane* and *Divine*; and consequently there is a twofold *Faith* distinguish'd by this double object, a *Humane* and a *Divine Faith*.

Humane

* *Testimoni-
orum quæ
sunt genera:
Divinum &
Humanum.
Divinum, ut
oracula, ut
auspicia, ut
vaticinationes,
& responsa
sacerdotum,
aruspicum,
conjectorum:
Humanum,
quod spectatur
ex auctoritate,
& ex voluntate,
& ex oratione
aut libera aut
expressa; in
quo insunt
scripta, pacta,
promissa,
jurata, quæ
sita. Cicero
Orat. Partit.*

Humane Faith is an Assent unto any thing Credible, merely upon the testimony of man. Such is the belief we have of the words and affections one of another: and upon this kind of faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of our life; according to the opinion we have of the ability and fidelity of him which relates or asserts any thing we believe or disbelieve. By this a friend assureth himself of the affection of his friend: by this the son acknowledgeth his father, and upon this is his obedience wrought. By vertue of this Humane Faith it is that we doubt not at all of those things which we never saw, by reason of their distance from us, either by time or place. Who doubts whether there be such a countrey as Italy, or such a City as Constantinople, though he never pass'd any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there were such a man as Alexander in the East, or Cesar in the West? and yet the latest of these hath been beyond the possibility of the knowledge of man these sixteen hundred years. There is no Science taught without original belief, there are no letters learnt without preceding faith. There is no Justice executed, no commerce maintain'd, no business prosecuted without this; † all secular affairs are transacted, all great achievements are attempted, all hopes, desires, and inclinations are preserved by this Humane Faith grounded upon the Testimony of man.

In which case we all by easie experience may observe the nature, generation, and progresse of *Belief*. For in any thing which belongeth to more then ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered: but if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth within the compass of his knowledge that we readily assent unto; and while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this *Assent* is properly *Belief*. Whereas if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the relatour which will satisfie us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity: but if we think him so just and honest, that he hath no design upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmations; and this *Assent* is our *Belief*. Seeing then our *Belief* relies upon the ability and integrity of the Relatour, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitfull, and so their integrity to be suspected, there can be no infallible universal ground of *Humane Faith*.

But what we cannot find in the testimony of man, we may be satisfied in the testimony of God. * *If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater.* Yea, let God be true, the ground of our Divine, and every man a liar, the ground of our Humane Faith.

As for the other member of the Division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined. *Divine Faith is an Assent unto something as Credible upon the Testimony of God.* This *Assent* is the highest kind of Faith, because the object hath the highest Credibility, because grounded upon the Testimony of God which is Infallible. Balaam could tell Ba-

† Non dicant non credimus quia non vidimus; quoniam si hæc dicant, coguntur fateri incertos sibi esse parentes suos. De fide rerum invisib. amongst the works of S. Augustin.

Αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰδότες ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἰσχυρὰ ἡ ἀπόφασις, ἀποδέχονται τὰς ἀποδείξεις. Menander apud Stob.

† ἡ ἀποδοχὴ τῆς ἀποδείξεως καὶ τῆς ἐπισημῆς ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις. Theodor. Therap. 1.

* εἰ δὲ γὰρ τὸ ἀποδεχόμενον τὴν ἀποδείξεως ἐστὶν τὴν ἀποδείξεως καὶ τῆς ἐπισημῆς ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις. ibid.

† πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ τὰ ἀποδείξεως καὶ τὰ ἀποδείξεως ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποδοχὴ τῆς ἀποδείξεως καὶ τῆς ἐπισημῆς ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις. Cyril. Catech. V. Orig. cont. Celsum, l. 1.

Euf. de Prep. Evang. 1.1.c.5. Arnob. adver. Gent. 1. 2.

* 1 John 5. 9. Rom. 3. 4.

Quam indi-

gnum ut humanis testimoniis de alio credamus, Dei oraculis de se non credamus. S. Ambros. l. de Abraham. c. 3. Πότε δὲ εἰς ἀποδοχὴν, πάντες οἱ ἀποδοχόμενοι πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῷ μυστικῷ τῷ θεῷ. Orig. ad. Celsum l. 1.

Numb. 23. 19.

1 Sam. 15. 19.

Psal. 18. 2.

1 Sam. 2. 3.

אל רעות

יהוה

Lxx. *Σὺς*

γινώσκων πάντας.

Psal. 147 5. in

the Heb.

לחבתיאין

ספפר

* Cujus sapientia simplici-
ter multi-
plex, & uni-
formiter mul-
tiformis, in-
comprehensi-
bili comprehen-
sione om-
nia incom-
prehensibilia
comprehendit. S. Augu-
stinus de

Civ. Dei. l. 12.

c. 18.

a. 1 Jo. 1. 5.

b Heb. 4. 13.

c Dent. 32. 4.

* *ὁ θεὸς πάντας
γινώσκων, ὁ
ἰσχυρὸς, ὁ
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*
Orig.
contra Celsum.

† Si velint in-
venire quod
omnipotens
non potest,
habent pro-
fus, ego di-
cam, mentiri
non potest.
S. Aug. de Civ.
Dei. l. 22. c. 25.

d 2 Tim. 2. 13.

e Heb. 6. 17. 18.

f Heb. 6. 13.

lak thus much, *God is not a man that he should lie*; and a better Prophet confirm'd the same truth to Saul, *The strength of Israel will not lie*; and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of Israel, even *my God, my strength, in whom I will trust*.

For first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as Hannah hath taught us, *the Lord is a God of knowledge*, or rather, if our language will bear it, *of knowledges*, which are so plurall, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the Psalmist hath said, *Of his understanding there is no number*. He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth and essentially knowledge, & as so, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of * comprehension, and not so onely, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known, we see them but as in a glasse or through a cloud; But *a God is light, and in him is no darknesse at all*: he seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his Understanding is most clear and evident, *b neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do*. Wherefore being all things are within the compasse of his knowledge, being all things which are so, are most clear and evident unto him, being the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceiv'd in any thing.

Secondly, the justice of God is equall to his knowledge, nor is his holiness inferiour to his wisdom: *a God of truth*, c saith Moses, *and without iniquity, just and right is he*. From which internall, essentiall and infinite rectitude, *d holiness and holiness*, followeth an impossibility to declare or deliver that for truth, which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be against that finite purity and integrity which is required of man, to lie, and therefore sinfull, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essentiall unto God. Although therefore the power of God be infinite, though he *can do all things*; yet we may safely say, without any * prejudice to his Omnipotency, that he † cannot speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise. For the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding; neither can he be unholy or unjust more then he can be ignorant or unwise. *d If we believe not, yet he abideth faithfull, he cannot deny himself*. Which words of the Apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions; neither should he more *deny himself* in violating his fidelity, then in contradicting his veracity. 'Tis true, that *e God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation*: but 'tis as true, that all this confirmation is onely for our consolation; otherwise it is as *impossible for God to lie* without an oath, as with one; for being he can *f swear by no greater, he sweareth onely by himself*, and so the strength even of the Oath of God relieth upon the Veracity of God. Wherefore being God as God is of infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, being it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man.

It

It is therefore most infallibly certain, that God being infinitely wise, cannot * be deceived; being infinitely good, cannot † deceive: and upon these two immoveable pillars standeth the Authority of the Testimony of God. For since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one, but by questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the Testimony. But where there is an intrinsecal * repugnancy of being deceived in the Understanding, and of deceiving in the Will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it, must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy: *He that believeth not God, saith the Apostle, hath made him a liar.* That truth then which is testified by God, hath a Divine Credibility: and an Assent unto it as so Credible, is Divine Faith. In which the material Object is the Doctrine which God delivereth, the formal Object is that Credibility founded on the † Authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of Divine Faith in general.

Now being the Credibility of all which we believe is founded upon the Testimony of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of Faith, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To which end it will be necessary to give notice that the Testimony of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated; nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by man, and then resolved and confirmed by interposing the authority of God; but he is then said to witness when he doth propound, and his testimony is given by way of Revelation, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his Creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of Faith it self, yet of the means and manner of Assent.

Wherefore it will be further necessary to observe, that divine Revelation is of two kinds, either Immediate or Mediate. An Immediate Revelation is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself without the intervention of man. A Mediate Revelation is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the Prophets, by the second in the Prophets, and by them unto us. Being then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the Prophets and to others, being the Faith both of Prophets and others relieth wholly upon divine Revelation, the * difference of the manner of Assent in these several kinds of believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our Faith.

plex est auditus & locutio, scilicet exterior sive corporalis, & interior ac spiritualis; ita duplex est fides, una quæ oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditum exteriorem, cum scilicet Deus per aliquos homines aliis credenda proponit; & ista est fides quæ nobis sive communi statui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adheremus revelationibus Prophetis & Apostolis factis: alia est quæ oritur in aliquibus per spirituales locutionem, qua Deus aliquibus per internam inspirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominis ministerio utens; sicut est fides Apostolorum & Prophetarum, qui ab ipso Deo per intrinsecam illuminationem sunt de credendis instructi. *Francisc. Ferrariensis in Thom. cont. Gent. cap. 40.*

* Ut sit omnium potens, mori non potest, falli non potest, mentiri non potest. *August. de Symb. ad catechum.*

† Deus facere fraudem nescit, pati non potest. *Chrysost. Sermo 62.*

* Autoritas Dei consistit in intrinseca repugnantia deceptionis seu falsitatis quam habet divinum iudicium, & in intrinseca repugnantia actus voluntatis imperantis testimonium extrinsecum non consentiens iudicio interno; quæ per terminos positivos actus intellectus infallibiliter veri, & actus voluntatis intrinsece & necessario recti poterit explicari. *Francisc. de Oviedo Tract. de Fide Contr. 2. pun. 2.*

† Divina est Auctoritas

cui credimus; divina est doctrina quam sequimur. *Leo. Serm. 7. in Nativ.*

* Sicut du-

Those

Those then to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name (of which I shall need here to make no distinction) those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal himself, did by virtue of the same Revelation perceive, know, and assure themselves that he which spake to them was God; so that at the same time, they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that Abraham would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by an immediate revelation of his will clearly commanded it.

a Thus by faith Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an Ark, to the saving of his house: which † warning of God was a clear Revelation of Gods determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command, for that end to build an Ark. And this Noah so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the Authority, as informed of the command. Thus the judgements hanging over Judah were revealed in the eares of *b* Isaiah by the Lord of hosts. Thus the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh: at first indeed he knew him not; that is, when the Lord spake, he knew it not to be the voice of God, *c* Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet reveal'd unto him; but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was He which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the * eares of Samuel were revealed, and the † word of God revealed, and ‖ God himself revealed to him. By all which we can understand no lesse, then that Samuel was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God: so Samuel the Seer, so the rest of the Prophets believ'd those truths revealed to them by such a Faith as was a firm Assent unto an object credible upon the immediate Testimony of God.

But those faithfull people to whom the Prophets spake, believed the same truth, and upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those Prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the Prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God appear'd unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, and then his will, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the Revelation of himself and of his will, and was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding still he doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them, not immediately by God, but by Moses, *And Moses answered and said, But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee.* Which words of his first suppose, that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth, upon a testimony divine, and then as rationally affirm, that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promi-

sed

a Heb. 11. 7.
† *misei* ἡμετέρας
ἡμετέρας, which
word comes
from the origi-
nal *λογος*, ap-
propriated by
the Greeks to
an Oracle, or
answer given
by God, *ὁ λόγος*
ἡμετέρας, ὁ λόγος
ἡμετέρας, *Moscho-*
pulus.

b Isa. 22. 14.

c 1 Sam. 3. 21.

את יהוה נלה את

און שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל, 1 Sam.

9. 15.

† שמואל יגלה אלי

דבר יהוה

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

1 Sam. 3. 7.

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

נלה את שמואל

fed by Moses, only because Moses said so. Which rational objection was clearly taken away when God endued Moses with power of evident and undoubted miracles; for then the Rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites that God had appeared unto him; as the flaming bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's omnipotency, could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity; insomuch as when Aaron became to Moses in *stead of a mouth*, and Moses to Aaron in *stead of God*, Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signes in the sight of the people, and the people believed. For being perswaded by a lively and active presence of Omnipotency that God had appeared unto Moses, and what was delivered to them by him, came to him from God; and being sufficiently assured out of the very sense and notion of a Deity, that whatsoever God should speak must of necessity be true, they presently assented, and believed the Lord and his servant Moses: Moses as the immediate propounder, God as the original revealer: they believed Moses that God had revealed it, and they believed the promise because God had revealed it. So that the Faith both of Moses and the Israelites was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed only in the proposition or application of the testimony; Moses receiving it immediately from God himself, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of Moses.

In the like manner the succeeding Prophets were the instruments of divine Revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them; and then the people as revealed by them: for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God deliver'd by man. *It was he who spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been since the world began: the mouth, the instrument, the articulation was theirs, but the words were God's. The spirit of the Lord spake by me, saith David, and his word was in my tongue.* It was the word of the Lord, which he spake by the hand of Moses, & by the hand of his servant Ahijah the Prophet. The hand the general instrument of man, the mouth the particular instrument of speech, both attributed to the Prophets as merely instrumental in their prophecies. The words which Balaam's ass spake were as much the asses words, as those which Balaam spake were his; for the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, & the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth; & not only so, but a bridle with that word, *only the word that I shall speak unto thee that thou shalt speak.* The Prophets as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and subsequent words interpret those words of S. Peter, *that no prophesie of the scripture is of any * private interpretation*; that is, that no Prophecie which is written did so proceed from the Prophet which spake or wrote it, that he of himself or by his own instinct did open his mouth to prophesie: but that all propheticall revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, *for the prophesie came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost.* That therefore which they delivered was the word, the Revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest

Exod. 4. 16.
Exod. 4. 30,
31.

Exod. 14. 31.

Luke 1. 70.

2 Sam. 23. 2.
1 Kin. 8. 53.
1 Kin. 14. 18.

Num. 22. 28.
Num. 23. 5.
Num. 22. 35.

2 Pet. 1. 20.
* ιδίᾳ ἑκάστου
συνεστῆς.

of the believers assented upon the same testimony of God mediately delivered by the hands of the prophets.

Heb. 1. 1.

Thus God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, and by so speaking propounded the Object of Faith both to the Prophets and the Fathers, hath in these last dayes spoken unto us by his Son, and by so speaking hath enlarged the Object of Faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the

Rev. 14. 12.

Joh. 1. 18.

Heb. 1. 3.

Col. 1. 19.

Col. 2. 9.

Joh. 16. 30.

Faith of Iesus. Thus the only begotten Son, who was in the bosome of the Father, the expresse image of his person, he in whom it pleased the Father that all fulnesse should dwell, he in whom dwelleth all the fulnesse of the Godhead bodily, revealed the will of God to the Apostles, who being assured that he knew all things, and convinced that he came forth from God, gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their Faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. I have given unto them, saith Christ unto his Father, the

Joh. 17. 8.

words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. Beside this delivery of these words by Christ to the Apostles,

Joh. 16. 13.

Joh. 14. 26.

they received the promise of the Spirit of truth which should guide them into all truth, and teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them. So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnish'd with divine illuminations and revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own faith; that each of

2 Tim. 1. 12.

them might well make that profession of S. Paul, I know whom I have believed. Thus the Faith of the Apostles, as of Moses and the Prophets, was grounded upon the immediate Revelations of God.

But those Believers to whom the Apostles preached, and whom they converted to the faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the Apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the Apostles, that is, immediately from God. But as the Israelites believed those truths which Moses spake, to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the Rod which he carried in his hand: so the blessed Apostles being so plentifully endued from above with the power of miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard S. Peter call a lame man unto his legs, speak a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did Ananias and Sapphira, might easily be perswaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his omnipotency, they might well expect him in his veracity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the Apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the Apostles they believed. Neither pray I for these alone saith Christ, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word. Thus the Apostles believed on Christ through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same Christ through the Apostles word: and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the Apostles was really distinct from the word of Christ, but only it was called theirs, because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed. That which was from the

1 Joh. 1. 1.

beginning, saith S. John, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word

of

of the word of life. That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you. 3.
 And this was the true foundation of faith in all them which believed, that they took not the words which they heard from the Apostles to be the words of the men which spake them, no more then they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles to be the power of them that wrought them; but as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When S. Paul preached at Antioch, *almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God*; so they esteemed it, though they knew him a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the Apostle commendeth in the Thessalonians, that *when they received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God*, and receiving it so, they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive nor be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true, and by so embracing it they assented unto it, by so assenting to it they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of S. Paul, as he speaks himself, *because our testimony among you was believed*. Thus the Faith of those which were converted by the Apostles was an *Assent unto the word as Credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony Apostolical*. Which being thus clearly stated, we may at last descend into our own condition, and so describe the nature of our own Faith, that every one may know what it is to believe.

Although Moses was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the Mount, and spake with him face to face at the door of the Tabernacle; although upon these grounds the Israelites believed what he delivered to them, as the word of God; yet neither the Miracles nor Moses did for ever continue with them; and notwithstanding his death, they and their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore it is observable which S. Stephen saith, *he received the lively oracles to give unto them*; the Decalogue he received from the hand of God, *written with the finger of God*, the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself, and so delivered them not a mortal word to die with him, but *living oracles* to be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief, when his Rod had ceas'd to broach the Rocks, and divide the Seas. Neither did he only tie them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but by foretelling and describing the prophets which should be rais'd in future ages, he put a further obligation upon them to believe their prophecies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the Israelites in all ages believed Moses, while he lived, by believing his words; after his death, by believing his writings. *Had ye believed Moses, saith our Saviour, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?* Wherefore the Faith of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was an *Assent unto the truths of the law as credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto them in the writings of Moses and the Prophets*.

In the like manner is it now with us. For although Christ first published the Gospel to those who *beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*; although the Apostles first converted those unto the faith, who heard them speak with tongues they never learn'd, they never heard before, and discover the thoughts of men they never saw before,

before, who saw the lame to walk, the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command: yet did not these Apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortened them by their constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine further confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations long survive them, and yet they left as great an obligation upon the Church in all succeeding ages to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words, and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore require the same readinesse of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While Moses lived and spake as a Mediatour between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the prophets while they preached. When Moses was gone up to Mount Nebo, and there died, when the rest of the prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he *made known unto the Apostles, as his friends, all things that he had heard of the Father,* then did the Apostles believe the writings of Moses & the Prophets, & the words of Christ; and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their faith, *and they believed the Scripture & the word which Jesus had said.* When Christ was ascended up into heaven, & the Holy Ghost came down, when the words which Christ had taught the Apostles were preached by them, and many thousand souls converted to the faith, they believed the writings of the Prophets and the words of the Apostles, and in these two was comprised the compleat object of their faith. When the Apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the Gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the summe of what they had received in writing for the continuation of the Faith in the Churches which they had planted, and the propagation thereof in other places, by those which succeeded them in their ordinary function, but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. *These things were written,* saith S. John, the longest liver and the latest writer, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

Those Christians then which have lived since the Apostles death, and never obtain'd the wish of S. Augustine, to see either Christ upon earth, or S. Paul in the pulpit, have believed the writings of Moses and the Prophets, of the Apostles and Evangelists; in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine Faith, and so *a the houshold of God is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,* who are continued unto us only in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he which put their writings into the definition of Faith, considering Faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the ** Schoolmen.* From whence we may at last conclude that the true nature of the Faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's Church now stands and shall continue to the end of the world, consists in this, that it is *an Assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets.*

To

Joh. 15. 15.

Joh. 2. 22.

Joh. 20. 31.
a Eph. 2. 20.
Prophetæ &
Apostoli super
quos omnium
Ecclesiarum
fundamenta
locantur. S. Hieron.
in Psal. 17.
Super Prophetas ædificatur
orbis terrarum credens in Domino. Russ. ib.
* Durand. l. 3.
Dist. 24. q. 1.
§. 9. Fides est habitus quo assentimus dictis Scripturæ propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis.

To believe therefore as the word stands in the Front of the CREED, and not only so, but is diffused through every Article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceiv'd, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive) and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets immediately inspired, moved, and acted by God, out of whose writings this brief summe of necessary points of Faith was first † collected. And as this is properly to believe, which was our first consideration; so to say I believe, is to make a Confession or external expression of the Faith, which is the second Consideration propounded.

Faith is an habit of the intellectual part of man, and therefore of it self invisible; and to believe is a spiritual act, and consequently immanent and internal, and known to no man but him who believeth: *a For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?* Wherefore Christ being not only the great Apostle sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the authour of our faith, but also the head of the Church, whose body consisteth of faithful members, and so the authour of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of faith, he must needs be imagin'd to have appointed some external expression and communication of it: especially considering that the sould of the Apostles was to go forth unto the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the Gospel, and gathered into the Church of Christ; which cannot be performed without an acknowledgement of the truth, and a profession of faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to Baptism, *b What doth hinder me to be baptiz'd?* saith the Eunuch. And Philip said, *if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.* And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that faith, he was admitted. *c For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the soul, and act of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same; the confession of the mouth is an external signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgement of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. * The ear receiveth the word, *faith cometh by hearing*; the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.* In the heart faith is seated; with the tongue confession is made; between these two salvation is † compleated. *e If thou shalt confesse with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* This faith of the heart every one ought, and is presum'd to have, this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the CREED, *I believe*; and if true, he may with comfort say, *the word of faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart*: first in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the prophet David, *g I have believed, therefore have I spoken.*

satur & geritur Sacramentum, Chrysol. Serm. 56. Quod à te & pro te repositur, intra te est, i. e. oris famulatus & cordis affectus, Euseb. Gall. e Rom. 10. 9. f Rom. 10. 8. de hoc sine dubio legimus per prophetam, prope est, inquit, in ore tuo, & in corde tuo, Euseb. Gall. g Psal. 116. 10.

Thus

† εχ' ας εδοξεν
ανδρα πασι συ-
νιστηται της πισ-
τεως, αλλα εν
πιστει γενησθαι
τα και ερωτατα
συλλαχθεντα μι-
αν αναμνησιν
της πιστεως
διδασκαλιν.
Cyril. catech.
Ecclesiarum
Patres de po-
pulorum sa-
lute solliciti
ex diversis
voluminibus
Scripturarum
collegerunt
testimonia
divinis gravi-
da Sacramen-
tis. Euseb.
Gall. in Sym.
a 1 Cor. 2. 11.
b Act. 8. 36. 37
c Rom. 10. 10.
Habe homo
unde credere
debeas, corde
fit confessio
ad iustitiam;
habe unde
debeas confi-
teri; ore con-
fessio fit ad
salutem. Chry-
sol. Serm. 56.
* Sermo creat
auditum, au-
ditus concipit
fidem, credu-
litate par-
turit fides,
confessionem
credulitas
nutrit, con-
fessio perpe-
tuam dat sa-
lutem, Chry-
sol. Serm. 60.
d Mat. 12. 34.
† Magnum,
filioli, per hoc
fidei nostrae
videmus esse
compendi-
um, quando
inter cor &
linguam to-
tum salutis
humanae ver-

Thus briefly from the second Consideration concerning Confession implied in the first words *I believe*, we shall passe unto the third Consideration, of the necessity & particular obligation to such a Confession.

If there were no other argument, yet being the Object of faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to be so by every one that believeth, being it is the nature of truth not to hide it self, but rather to desire the light that it might appear; this were sufficient to move us to a *Confession* of our *Faith*. But beside the nature of the thing, we shall find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such a profession. For first, from the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the Object of our faith, by which we came under a possibility of faith, we have also received an expresse command to make a *Confession* of the same; ^a *Be ready*, saith S. Peter, *alwayes to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you*; and there can be no reason of hope but what is grounded on faith,

^a 1 Pet. 3. 14.

^b Rom. 10. 10.

^c Mat. 10. 32.

^d Luke 9. 26.

* ὁ πόνος ἡγούνα
τῆς ἀληθείας ἀ-
κλινῆς ἐστὶν ὁ
ἡσυχάζων ἐν δὲ
τῷ βαπτισμῷ
τῷ εἰλημῇ.

Iren. l. i. c. i.

Cum sub tri-

bus & testa-

tio fidei &

sponsio salu-

tis pignoren-

tur, necessa-

rio adjicitur

Ecclesiæ

mentio, quo-

niam ubi tres,

id est, Pater,

Filius, & Spi-

ritus Sanctus,

ibi Ecclesia,

quæ trium

corpus est.

Tertul. de Ba-

ptis. In quem

tingere? in

pœnitenti-

am? quo er-

go illi præ-

cursorum? in

peccatorum

remissionem,

quam verbo

dabat? in se-

metipsum,

quem humi-

litate celabat?

in Spiritum Sanctum, qui nondum à Patre descenderat? in Ecclesiam, quam nondum Apostoli struxe-

runt? Id. Dehinc ter mergimur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determi-

navit. Id. de Cor. Militis. Sed & ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in Baptismo testis est veritatis. nam cum dici-

mus, *Credis in vitam æternam, & remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam?* intelligimus remissio-

nem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari. S. Cyprianus, Ep. ad Januarius, &c. Quod si aliquis illud

opponit, ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbo-

lo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem filium Christum, eundem Spiritum

Sanctum, ac propterea usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione

ment of this. Secondly, tis true indeed that the great promises of the Gospel are made unto faith, and glorious things are spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the *Confession* of faith ^b together with it; and we know who it is hath said, ^c *Whosoever shall confesse me before men, him will I confesse also before my Father which is in heaven*. Besides, the profession of the faith of one Christian confirmeth and edifieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an obligation upon every particular. Again, the matters of faith contain so much purity of doctrine, perswade such holiness of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so merciful in his Son, so wonderful in all his works, that the sole confession of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly, the concealing those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so far from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoureth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to profess, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the authour of it, as if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us, hath also said unto us, ^d *Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy Angels*. Such a necessity there is of Confession of Faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorified in it; in respect of our selves, who shall be rewarded for it, and in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisdom of the Church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the CREED at the * first initiation into the Church by Baptism, (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to

be baptized, immediately† before the great solemnity of Easter) and to require a particular repetition of it publicly as often as the Sacrament of the Eucharist was administered, and a constant and perpetual inculcation of the same by the * Clergy to the people.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice useful and advantageous; so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe*. As if Christ did question every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind, after he had restored him his sight, (and we are all in his condition) *a doest thou believe on the Son of God?*

baptismi à nobis non discrepare : sciat quisquis hoc opponendum patat, non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem inter-

rogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum*, & vitam æternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam? mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Ecclesiam. Idem, Epist. ad Magnum. Mosibi (id est, Romæ) servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam Baptismi susceperunt sunt, publice, id est, fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum reddere. Ruffin. in Symb. Solenne est in lavacro, post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, *Credis in Sanctam Ecclesiam?* credis remissionem peccatorum? S. Hieron. contra Lucifer. Mens hæretica reliquit Doctorem à quo fidem Ecclesiæ didicerat, oblita est pacti Dei sui, hoc est, fidei ipsius Dominicæ quæ in Symbolo continetur, quam se die baptismatis servaturum esse promiserat. Id. comm. in Prov. Interrogatus es, *Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* dixisti, Credo, & merxisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, *Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum,* & in crucem ejus? dixisti, Credo, & merxisti, ideo & Christo es confectus. Tertio interrogatus, *Credis in Spiritum Sanctum?* dixisti, Credo; tertio merxisti: ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio. Ambros. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 7. Καὶ οὕτως παρὰ τὸ βαπτισμὸν τοῦ κυρίου πάλιν αὐτὸν ἐρωτοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμετέραν εἰς καὶ οὗτοι τοὺς λατρὸν ἐλαβεύουσιν. Busef. of the confession of faith which he exhibited to the Council of Nice. Socr. l. i. c.8. Theodor. l. i. c. 12. Abrenunciavit, inquit, Diabolo, pompis, spectaculis, & operibus ejus; & quid polleat? Credo, inquit, in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Salvianus de Gubern. Dei. lib. 6. And when this Creed was enlarged by the Council of Nice, and after that by others, Epiphanius commands it to the Catechumeni, to be repeated at their Baptisme; in quibus verbis ipse κατηγορεῖται τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ ἀρχαίου λέγοντες ἐρωτοῦντας, ἵνα μὴ ἀπαγγέλλωμεν ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν τὸ πιστεύοντα καὶ ταῦτα οὕτως ἐκείνους ἐρωτοῦντας, ὥς πάντων ἢ αὐτῷ μητρὶ ᾧδὲ τε καὶ ἡμῶν τοῦ λήγειν, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, &c. Epiph. in Anacorato. And when he had yet further enlarged it by reason of some new emergent heresies, he commands it, μέγιστα τοῖς τῶ ἀρχαίῳ κατὰ τὴν ἐρώτησιν, ἵνα ἀπαιτῆται αὐτῶν τὸ λήγειν ὅπως. Ib. The first Council of Constantinople confirms the Nicene Confession as παραχρησάτωσαν τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν πίστιν ἐκκλησίαν, τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρώτων πατέρων. Theodor. lib. 5. cap. 9. and the Council of Chalcedon of the same, ἡν, ὡς καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἀρίστην Σύνοδον, τοῖς μεμνημένοις περὶ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως παρὴν ὑμῶν ἀσφαλεῖαν. Tarte tertia, the Synod at Hiernusalem. τὸ ἀγιον Σύμβολον ἐστὶν ἱκανὸν ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς. the Synod at Tyre, ἐν αὐτῇ συνελθόντες καὶ βασιλικοῖς καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς. and the Council of Constantinople under Menna, to which the former sent their Synactical Letters, τὸ ἀγιον Σύμβολον ἐστὶν ὁ παντός ἱκανὸν ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς. Concil. Constantinopol. Agap. & Menna. Act. 5. Basiliscus and Marcus in two several Edicts, confirmed the same Nicene Creed with these words, εἰς δὲ ἡμέας τε καὶ πάντας ἡς σε θεοῦ ἡμῶν μετάνοιαν ἱκανὸν ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς. Enagel. lib. 3. cap. 4. and 7. and the Edit of the Emperour Justinian, Anathematizaverunt eos qui aliam definitionem fidei, five Symbolum, five Mathema tradunt accedentibus ad sanctum baptismum. † Οὗτοι δὲ τὰς συναγωγὰς τὴν πίστιν ἐμμανδάνειν καὶ τὴν πέμπτην τῆς ἐκδόσης ἀπαιτῆσαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ τοῖς προσβυτάγοις. Concil. Laodic. Can. 46. Where it is to be observed that πίστις is taken for the Creed, or Symbolum fidei, and was so translated anciently, as appeareth by the Canon preferred in the Canon-law and rendred thus. Baptizandos oportet Fidei Symbolum discere, & quinta feria ultimæ septimanæ vel Episcopo vel Presbyteris reddere. De Consecr., dist. 4. cap. 58. Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus Ecclesijs una die, i. e. ante octo dies Dominicæ resurrectionis publice in Ecclesia competentibus prædicari. Concil. Agath. capit. 13. Sicut antiqui Canones jubent ante viginti dies Baptismi ad purificationem exorcismi Catechumeni curant in quibus viginti diebus omnino Catechumeni Symbolum, quod est, Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, specialiter doceantur, Concil. Bracar. 2. cap. 1. The Canon of the Laodicean Council already mentioned, is verbatim rehearsed in the sixth Council in Trullo, Can. 78. It appeareth therefore a General command of the Church, that those who were to be baptized, should have a certain time allotted for the learning and rehearsing of the Creed. And in case of Necessity if any were baptized, they were to learn the Creed immediately after their Baptisme. ὅταν δὲ (not, as it is in the Edition of Binius both in this Canon, and the former most absurdly ὅταν δὲ) τὰς ἐνώπιον παρελαμψάντας τὸ φώτισμα, καὶ εἴτα ἀναστάντας ἐμμανδάνειν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ γνώσκουν ὅτι δεῖας δωρεὰς καθ' ἑκάστην. Concil. Laod. Can. 47. As appears in the ancient Greek Liturgies, and the decree of the third Council of Toledo, ut omni sacrificii tempore ante communionem corporis Christi & sanguinis, juxta Orientalium partium morem, unanimiter clara voce sacratissimum fidei recefant Symbolum. * Concil. Mogum. cap. 45. Symbolum quod est signacu-

every

every single Christian is taught to make the same Answer which he made, *Lord, I believe*. As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered together in his name, what he promised to one of the multitude whose son had a dumb spirit, *If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth*; each one for himself returneth his answer, *Lord, I believe; Lord, help my unbelief*. Not that it is unlawfull of unfit to use another number, and in stead of I, to say *We believe*; for taking in of others, we exclude not our selves; and addition of charity can be no disparagement to confession of faith. S. Peter answered for the twelve, *We believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God*. For though Christ immediately replied that one of them had a devil, yet is not S. Peter blam'd who knew it not. But every one is taught to expresse his own faith, because by that he is to stand or fall; the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much for the benefit of his brother, but his faith availeth nothing for the justification of another. And it is otherwise very fit that our faith should be manifested by a particular confession, because it is effectual by particular application; therefore must it needs be proper for me to say, *I believe*, and to make profession of my faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Mat. 9. 17.

23.

24.

Job. 6. 69.

Jam. 5. 16.

Gal. 2. 20.

Having then described the true nature and notion of *Belief*, the duty of *confessing* our faith, and the obligation of every particular Christian to *believe* and to *confesse*, being in these three explications all which can be imaginably contained in the first word of the CREED must necessarily be included; it will now be easie for me to deliver, and for every particular person to understand what it is he saies, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he begins his *Confession* with these words, *I believe*, which I conceive may in this manner be fitly expressed.

Although those things which I am ready to affirm, be not apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them; although they be not evident to my understanding of themselves, nor appear unto me true by the virtue of any natural and necessary cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science of them: yet being they are certainly contained in the Scriptures, the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets; being they were endued with miraculous power from above, and immediately inspired with the Holy Ghost, and consequently what they deliver'd was not the word of man, but of God himself; being God is of that universal knowledge and infinite wisdom that it is impossible he should be deceiv'd, of that indefectible holiness and transcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, and consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true; I readily and stedfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully and absolutely, and more concerningly perswaded of them, then of any thing I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them hath done it, not for my benefit only, but for the advantage of others; nor for that alone, but also for the manifestation of his own glory: being for those ends he hath commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternal reward upon my profession of them; being every particular person is to expect the justification of himself, and the salvation of his soul, upon the condition of his own faith; as with a certain and full perswasion I assent unto them, so with

lowing Articles of the Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, &c. and || generally speak of the Creed as of nothing but mere matter of faith, without any intimation of hope,* love, or any such notion included in it. So that *believing in* by virtue of the phrase or manner of speech, whether we look upon the original use of it in the Hebrew, or the derivative in the Greek, or the sense of it in the first Christians in the Latine Church, can be of no further real importance in the Creed in respect of God, who immediately follows, then to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagin'd a slender notion or small part of the first Article of our faith, when it really is the foundation of this and all the rest; that as the Creed is fundamental in respect of other truths, this is the † foundation even of the fundamentals. *For he that cometh to God must believe that he is.* And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, *I believe in God*, that is, *I believe that God is.*

As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration, first, of the Notion of God, what is here understood by that name. Secondly, of the existence of God, how we know or believe that he is. Thirdly, the Unity of God, in that, though *there be gods many, and lords many*, yet in our Creed we mention him as but one. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered, what is the true notion of God in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure our selves of the existence of such a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first Article; then may every one understand what he sayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe in God.*

The name of God is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him, who by way of eminency and excellency bears that name, and therefore is stiled *a God of gods. The Lord our God is God of gods, and Lord of lords.* and in the same respect is called *b the most high God*, (others being but inferiour or under him,) and *God ever or above all.* This eminency and excellency by which these titles become proper unto him and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not, and therefore are not by nature gods. *d Then when ye knew not God*, saith S. Paul, *ye did service to them which by nature are not gods.* There is then a God by nature, and others which are called gods, but by nature are not so; for either they have no power at all, because no being, but only in the false opinions of deceived men, as the gods of the Heathen; or if they have any reall power or authority, from whence some are called gods in the Scripture, yet have they it not

Greg. Nyssen calls them *θεοθεοι* and *θεοκρατορες*. and Eusebius in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice concludes, *Πιστευομεν και εις τον ανθρωπον υιον του θεου, του αληθινου ενα, και υπαρχοντος παντοκράτου.*

signifying that every particular which he had rehearsed, he believed to be, and that was all in the Confession intended. Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, after a long declaration of the former Articles concerning the Father and the Son, draws to a conclusion on the latter Articles, thus.

Πιστεωμεν οτι ο θεος εστις (i. θεος βεβαιον) ταυτην πατρι πατρος και υιου θεου. εν ανθρωπο αληθινον υιον απογονου. μιαν και μονην και θεολογικην την Αποστολικην εκκλησιαν. μετα ταυτην (vel ταυτην) εν γενει ανθρωπων ειδωμεν.

Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 4.* So Tertul. de *Prescript. adv. Hæret.* Regula est fidei illa qua creditur Unum omnino Deum esse. and *adv. Irateam, cap. 2.* where he makes another rehearsal of his Creed, he begins with *Unicum quidem Deum credimus.* * Non est amor Dei Articulus, neque etiam amor proximi, quia etiam si sint præcepta generalia activa, tamen cum actio contineatur, non oportet eum constituere articulum; sed ista sunt fidei dogmata quæ sunt columnæ & fundamenta legis divinæ. If. A. *bravanel, de Cap. Fidei. c. 11.* Heb. 11. 6. Primus est Deorum cultus, Deos credere. Sen. † Maimonides de *Fundam. Legis.* וידוע כי המעשה הראשון והוא מציא כל נמצא the foundation of foundations, and pillar of wisdoms is to know that the first being is, and that it giveth existence to every thing which is. 1 Cor. 8. 5. a Deut. 10. 17. Psal. 136. 2. Dan. 2. 47. and 11. 36. b Gen. 14. 18. frequently. c Rom. 9. 5. Ephes. 4. 6. Impiis necesse est concedatis esse aliquem sublimiorem Deum & mancipem quendam divinitatis qui ex hominibus Deos fecerit. Tertul. *adv. Gentes.* d Gal. 4. 8.

* *Ego dixi, Dii estis, sed in eo indulti nominis significatio est. & ubi refertur, ego dixi, loquentis est potius sermo quam rei nomen. S. Hilary de Trin. l. 7. † Deus plenæ ac perfectæ divinitatis est nomen. Hilary de Trin. l. 11. Deus substantiæ ipsius nomen, id est, divinitatis. Tertul. adv. Herm.*

from themselves or of their own * nature, but from him who *only hath immortality*, and consequently *only divinity*, and therefore is the *only true † God*. So that the Notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signify a being or nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a Nature or being consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of it self; and potentiall or causative of all beings beside it selfe, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed. 'Tis true indeed, that to give a perfect definition of *God* is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity: but yet a sense of this Divinity we have, and the first and common notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a being of it self, and independent from any other; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; that it governs all things. And this I conceive sufficient as to the first consideration, in reference to the notion of a *God*.

As for the existence of such a being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what meanes we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is. For although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connaturall to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a *God*; yet I rather conceive the soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning, but to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth table without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection; then must we not referre the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion.

Again, although others do affirm, that the existence of *God* is a truth evident of it self; so as whosoever hears but these terms once named, that *God is*, cannot chuse but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater then any part, who knoweth only what is meant by whole, and what by part; so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of *God*, who knows but what is meant by *God*, and what it is to be: Yet can we not ground our knowledge of *God's* existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence: nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced; it being a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because 'tis evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore only doubts of it because it is not evident unto him.

Although therefore that, *God is*, be of it self an immediate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be * evidenced and made apparent unto us, by its connexion unto other truths; so that the being of the Creatour may appear unto us by his Creature, and the dependency of inferiour entities lead us to a clear acknowledgement of the su-

* Hæc propositio Deus est quantum in se est, per se nota est, quia prædicatum est idem cum subiecto, Deus enim est suum esse. Sed quia nos non scimus de Deo quid est, non est nobis per se nota, sed indiget demonstrari per ea, quæ sunt magis nota quoad nos, & minus nota quoad naturam, scilicet per effectus. *Aqui, l. 1. p. q. 2. Art. 1.*

preme and independent being. The wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper; for by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, proportionably the maker of them is seen: and not only they, but S. Paul hath taught us, that the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead. For if † Phidias could so contrive a piece of his own work, as in it to preserve the memory of himself, never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work; well may we read the great Artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, and by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first cause of all things.

Wisd. of Sol.
13. 5.
Rom. 1. 20,
† In the shield
of Pallas. A-
rist. de Mun-
do.

We find by the experience of our selves, that some things in this world have a beginning before which they were not; the account of the years of our age sufficiently inferre our nativities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to it self. Whatsoever is, must of necessity either have been made, or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made. For whatsoever is made, is made by another, neither can any thing produce it self; otherwise it would follow, that the same thing is and is not at the same instant in the same respect; it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced; it is therefore in being, and is not in being, which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other which produced them, either was it self produced, or was not; and if not, then have we already an Independent being; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an * infinite succession in causalities, by which nothing will be made; both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confesse was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings singly considered by themselves do not inferre one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and † connexion of things shew as much; and this one supreme cause is God. For all things which we see or know, have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth the uses and utilities of every species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause; and a final Cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing then as it moves the efficient cause to work; from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, indued with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of the ends of all, designed, produced, and disposed all things to those ends.

Again, as all things have their existence, so have they also their operations for some * ends; and whatsoever worketh so, must needs be directed to it. Although then those creatures which are indued with reason, can thereby apprehend the goodnesse of the end for which they work, and make choice of such means as are proportionable and proper for the obtaining of it, and so by their own counsel direct themselves unto it: yet can we not conceive, that other natural agents whose operations flow from a bare instinct, can be directed in their actions by any counsel of their own. The stone doth not deli-

Wisd. of Sol.
13.5.

Rom, I. 20,

† In the shield
of Pallas. A-
rist. de Mun-
do.

* Ἀλλὰ μὴ ὅτι
γίνονται ἀρχαί πνεύματος
ἐκ ἀπειροῦ τὰ
αἰνὰ ἡμῶν ὁρῶντες
ἐγὼ εἰς ἐκτενέστερον
καὶ ἐκτενέστερον
ἐκτενέστερον. *A-*
rists. Metaph.
l. 2. c. 2. and

[illegible]

berate whether it shall descend, nor doth the wheat take counsel whether it shall grow or no. Even men in natural actions use no act of deliberation; we do not advise how our heart shall beat, though without that pulse we cannot live; when we have provided nutriment for our stomach, we take no counsel how it shall be digested there, or how the chyle distributed to every part for the reparation of the whole; the mother which conceives taketh no care how that conceptus shall be framed, how all the parts shall be distinguished, and by what means or wayes the child shall grow within her womb; and yet all these operations are directed to their proper ends, and that with a greater reason, and therefore by a greater wisdom, then what proceeds from any thing of humane understanding. What then can be more clear, then that those natural agents which work constantly for those ends which they themselves cannot perceive, must be directed by some high and overruling Wisdom? and who can be their directour in all their operations tending to those ends, but he which gave them their being for those ends? and who is that but the great Artificer who works in all of them? For Art is so far the imitation of nature, that if it were not in the artificer, but † in the thing it self which by Art is framed, the works of Art and Nature would be the same. Were that which frames a watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of man, it would seem to grow into that form; nor would there be any distinction between the making of that watch, and the growing of a plant. Now what the Artificer is to works of Art, who orders and disposes them to other ends then by nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all natural agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the Maker to be the Ruler of the world, * the steerer of this great ship, the law of this universal Commonwealth, the General of all the hosts of heaven and earth. By these wayes as by the † testimony of the creature, we come to find an eternal and independent Being, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed; and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of God.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the publick and universal reason of the world. ¶ No age so distant, no countrey so remote, no people so barbarous, but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth. When the Roman Eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with Atheisme no where, but rather by their miscellany Deities at Rome, which grew together with their victories, they shewed no nation was without its God. And since the later Art of Navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the customes of the people be much different, and their manner of religion holds small correspondency with any in these parts of the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a Divinity they acknowledge. So much of the *Creed* hath been the general *Confession* of all nations, *I believe in God*. Which were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could we give of so universal a consent? or how can it be imagined, that all men should * conspire to deceive themselves and their posterity?

Nor is the reason only general, and the consent unto it universal, but

† ἀποστον τὸ μὴ
εἶδεν ἴσχυα πῶς
γινέσθαι, ἐὰν μὴ
ἴδωσι τὸ κινεῖν
βυβαυσιμύον·
καὶ τοὶ καὶ ἡ πῆ-
χυν εἰ βυβαυσιμύον·
καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἐπὶ ἐν
τῷ ἔδαφιν ἡ ναυ-
πηγὴ, ὁμοίως αὖ
τῇ φύσει ἵπποισι.

Arist. ib.

* Καὶ δὲ οὐκ ὅτι ἐν
τῇ καὶ ἐργασίᾳ, ἐν
ἐργασίᾳ μὲν οὐκ
ἐν ἔργῳ δὲ καὶ οὐκ
ἐν ἔργῳ, ἐν ἔργῳ
δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἔργῳ,
ἐν ἔργῳ δὲ καὶ οὐκ
ἐν ἔργῳ, ἐν ἔργῳ
δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἔργῳ.

Arist. de
Mundo.

† Habet Do-
minus testi-
monium to-
tum hoc quod
sumus, & in
quo sumus.

Tertul.

¶ ἀρχαῖος πε-
λόγος καὶ πα-
λαιός ἐστι πᾶσιν
ἀνθρώποις, οὗ ἐν
δεῖτα ὅτι πάντα,
καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ
ἐνίσταται.

Arist. de
Mundo.

* Nulla gens
usquam est
adeo contra
leges moref-
que projecta,
ut non ali-
quos Deos
credat. Sen.

* Nec in hunc
furorem om-
nes mortales
consensissent
alloquendi
furda numina
& inefficaces
Deos. Sen.

but God hath still preserved and quickened the worship due unto his name, by the patefaction of himself. Things which are to come, are so beyond our knowledge, that the wisest man can but conjecture; and being we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of several free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefactions. For none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work, none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends, none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a Prophecie, by the same we may be secured of a Divinity. Except then all the Annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of history designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect Gods existence, having so ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed which is not within the compasse of the power of any naturall agent, if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no naturall aptitude so to work, it must be ascribed to a Cause transcending all natural causes and disposing all their operations. Thus every Miracle proves its authour, and every act of omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a Deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weaknesse of our fathers, and the testimony of all former ages, who shall deny that ever any Miracle was wrought. *We have heard with our eares, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didst in their dayes, in the times of old. Blessed be the Lord God who only doth wondrous works.*

*Psal. 44. 1.
72. 18.*

Nor are we only informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their Universal cause, or his external patefactions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgement of mankind; but every particular person hath a particular Remembrancer in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creatour, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of Conscience in all men, by which their *thoughts* are ever *accusing or excusing them*; they feel a comfort in those virtuous actions which they find themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of a Divinity out of their own souls, have not been least sensible of this remembrancer in their breasts. 'Tis true indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of conscience is onely grounded upon an opinion of a Deity, and that opinion may be false. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest writers of most different persuasions, and experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations do agree, that the remorse of conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth then supposeth an opinion of a Divinity; and that man which most peremptorily denieth Gods existence, is
the

Rom. 2. 15.

* Hæc est summa dei-
di, nolle ag-
noscere quem
ignorare non
possis. S. Cypr.
de Idol. Van.

a Act. 17. 27,
28.

b Act. 17. 28.

† Solum De-
um confirmas
quem tantum
Deum nomi-
nas. Tertul. de
Testim. Ani-

ma, c. 2.

When Leo Bi-
shop of Rome
in an Epistle
to Flavianus
had written
these words,
Fidelium u-
niversitas

profiteretur
credere se in
Deum pa-
trem omni-
potentem, &
in Jesum
Christum fi-
lium ejus,

One of the Eu-
tychians ob-
jected with this

Question, Cur

non dixerit

in unum De-

um patrem, &

in unum J-
sum, juxta

Nicæni De-
cretum Con-
cilii: to which

Vigilius, Bi-
shop of Trent,

gives this an-
swer, Sed Ro-

ma & ante-

quam Nicæ-

na Synodus

conveniret à

temporibus 3

Apostolorum

usque ad

nunc ita fide-

libus Symbo-

lum traditur,

nec præjudi-

cant verba u-

bi sensus in-

columis per-

manet: magis enim cum D. J. Christi sententia hæc fidei professio facit dicentis, *Creditis in Deum,*

& in me credite, nec dixit in unum Deum patrem, & in unum meipsum. Quis enim nesciat unum esse Deum & unum J. Christum filium ejus? *Vigil. l. 4. con. Eutyech, Rab. Chasdai in Or Adonai. R. Jo-*

seph Albo in Hikkarim.

the greatest Argument himself that there is a God. Let Caligula pro-
fesse himself an Atheist, and with that profession hide his head, or run
under his bed, when the thunder strikes his eares, and lightning flash-
es in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the
power, and his own guilt of the justice of God; whom while in his
wilfull opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he
strongly asserteth. So that a Deity will either be granted or extort-
ed, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Only
unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to
others, who will not * acknowledge his existence, of whose power he
cannot be ignorant. *God is not far from every one of us.* The proper
discourse of S. Paul to the Philosophers of Athens was that *they might*
feel after him and finde him. Some children have been so ungracious as
to refuse to give the honour due unto their parent, but never any so
irrational as to deny they had a father. As for those who have disho-
noured God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore
they may wish there were none, but cannot consist with their reason
to assert there is none, when even the very Poets of the heathen have
taught us *that we are his offspring.*

It is necessary thus to believe there is a God. First, because there can
be no Divine Faith without this belief. For all Faith is theretore on-
ly Divine, because it relyeth upon the Authority of God giving Testi-
mony to the object of it; but that which hath no being can have no
Authority, can give no Testimony. The ground of his Authority is
his Veracity, the foundations of his Veracity are his Omniscience
and Sanctity, both which suppose his essence and existence, because
what is not is neither knowing nor holy.

Secondly it is necessary to believe a Deity, that thereby we may ac-
knowledge such a nature extant as is worthy of, and may justly chal-
lenge from us, the highest worship and adoration. For it were vain to
be religious, and to exercise devotion, except there were a being to
which all such holy applications were most justly due. Adoration im-
plies submission and dejection, so that while we worship we cast down
our selves; there must be therefore some great eminence in the ob-
ject worshipped, or else we should dishonour our own nature in the
worship of it. But when a Being is presented of that intrinsecall and
necessary perfection that it depends on nothing, and all things else
depend on that, and are wholly governed and disposed by it, this
worthily calls us to our knees, and shews the humblest of our devoti-
ons to be but just and loyal retributions.

This necessary truth hath been so universally received, that we
shall alwayes finde all nations of the world more prone unto Idolatry
then to Atheisme, and readier to multiply then deny the Deity. But
our Faith teacheth us equally to deny them both, and each of them
are renounced in these words *I believe in God.* First, *in God* affirmative-
ly, *I believe* he is, against Atheisme. Secondly, *in God* exclusively, not
in Gods, against Polytheisme and Idolatry. Although therefore the
Existence and Unity of God be two distinct truths, yet are they of so
necessary dependence, and intimate coherence, that both may be ex-
pressed by † one word, and included in one ¶ Article.

And

And that the Unity of the Godhead is included in this Article is apparent, not onely because the Nicene Council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also because this Creed in the † Churches of the East, before the Council of Nice, had that addition in it, *I believe in one God*. We begin our Creed then, as ‖ Plato did his chief and prime Epistles, who gave this distinction to his friends, that the Name of God was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of Gods in the plurall, to such as were more vulgar and triviall. *a* Unto thee it was shewed, saith Moses to Israel, *that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him*. And as the Law, so the Gospel teacheth us the same, *b* *we know that an Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one*. This Unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods then one, as that there should be none: which will clearly be demonstrated, first, out of the Nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and secondly, from the Government as he is Lord, in which we must not admit Confusion.

For first the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and originall cause of all things, as an independent being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or final cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings then one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself, *c* *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called, I am he, I am the first, I also am the last*. And from this primity he challengeth his Unity; *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israe, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God*.

Again if there were more Gods then one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently, and virtually, for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledgement God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable which are simply such must be contained formally, and all others which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments brought from the infinite perfections of the divine nature, able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme Dominion sufficient to perswade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedome doth he govern and dispose of all things, *d* *He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth*, said Nebuchadnezzar out of his experience; and S. Paul expresseth him as *working all things after the counsel of his own will*. If then there were more supreme governours of the world then one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, then which nothing can be more prejudicial unto Government. God is a God of order, not confusion, and therefore of unity, not admitting multiplication. If it

† Orientales Ecclesiae omnes ista tradunt, Credo in uno Deo patre omnipotentem. Ruffin Symb. Bene hac omnia poterunt ad solos Haereticos pertinere; quia falsaverunt Symbolum, dum alter dixerit duos Deos, cum Deus unus sit. Optat. l. 1. Nos enim & sci-mus, & legimus, & credimus, & tenemus, unum esse Deum, qui fecit cælum pariter ac terram, quoniam nec alterum novimus, nec nosse, cum nullus sit, aliquando poterimus. Novatianus de Trinit. c. 30. And before all these Irenaeus, citing under the title of Scripture a passage out of the book of Hermas called Pastor. Bene ergo Scriptura dicit. Primo omnium crede quoniam unus est Deus qui omnia constituit & consummavit, & fecit ex eo quod non e-

rat, ut essent omnia, omnium capax, & qui à nemine capiatur, l. 4. c. 37. *e* Euf. in prep. Evang. the passage is yet extant in the Epistles of Plato, *d* Dent. 4. 35. *b* 1 Cor. 8. 4. *c* Isa. 48. 12. 44. 6. *d* Dan. 4. 35.

τα ὅσα ἐ-
στὶν πολλα-
κῶς καὶ ὁ
καὶ ὁ ὅλος
καὶ ὁ ὅλος
καὶ ὁ ὅλος

Arist. Metaph.
l. 12. c. ult.

† Unus o-
mnium Do-
minus est De-
us: neque e-
nim illa sub-
limitas po-
test habere
confortem,
cum sola o-
mnem teneat
potestatem.

*S. Cyr. de 1-
dol. Panit.*

אחד זה
הוא ואין
שנים ולא

יותר על
שנים
אלא אחד שאין

ביותר אחד מן
האחרים
הנמצאים

בעולם לא
אחד במין שהוא
כולל אחרים

הרבה: ולא אחד
בנוף שהוא נחלק
למחלקות

ולקצותיו אלא
אחד שאין יותר

אחד מיותר
בעולם:

*God is one, not
two, or more
than two, but
only One; whose
unity is not
like to that of
the Individuals
of this world,*

neither is he

one by way of Species comprehending many individuals, neither one in the manner of a body

which is divisible into parts and extremes: but he is so one, as no Unity like his is to be found in the

world. Moses Maim. de Fundam. Legis. Quod autem diximus Orientis Ecclesias tradere unum Pa-

trēm Omnipotentem, & unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed

universitate: verbi gratia, si quis dicat unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero po-

suit, potest enim & alius homo esse, & tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus & tertius non potest

jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum

solem, hic unus ita dicitur ut alius vel tertius addi non possit, multo magis Deus cum unus dicitur,

unus non numeri sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicatur, quod a-

lius non sit. Ruffin. in Symb. a Isa. 45. 5, 6. Deut. 4. 35. 32. 39. Psal. 18. 31. b Isa. 45. 18, 21.

*22. Isa. 44. 8. c Job. 17. 3. * Veritas Christiana districte pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est non*

est: quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcumque non ita fuerit ut esse debeat: Tertul. adv. Marcion.

l. 1. c. 2. Deus cum summum magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est,

non est. Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicendo, si non unus, non est Deus; sed quia, quem con-

fidentius esse, idem definiamus esse, quod si non est Deus, non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro

summum magnum unicum sit necesse est, ergo & Deus unicus erit non aliter Deus, nisi summum ma-

gnum, nec aliter summum magnum nisi parem non habens, nec aliter parem non habens, nisi unicus

fuerit, ibid.

be better that the *Universe should be governed by one then many, we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God, but what is best. He therefore who made all things, by that right is Lord of all, and because all † power is his, he alone ruleth o-
ver all.

Now God is not onely *One*, but hath an *Unity* † peculiar to himself by which he is the *Only* God; and that not onely by way of actuality, but also of possibility. Every individual man is one, but so as there is a second and a third, and consequently every one is part of a number, and concurring to a multitude. The Sun indeed is one; so as there is neither third nor second Sun: but though there be not, yet there might have been; neither in the unity of the solar nature is there any repugnancy to plurality; for that God which made this world, and in this, *the Sun to rule the day*, might have made another world by the same fecundity of his omnipotency, and another Sun to rule in that. Whereas in the Divine nature there is an intrinsecal and essential singularity, because no other Being can have any existence but from that, and whatsoever Essence hath it's existence from another is not God. *a I am the Lord*, saith he, *and there is none else, there is no God besides me: that they may know from the rising of the Sun, and from the West, that there is none besides me; I am the Lord, and there is none else.* He who hath infinite knowledge knoweth no other God beside himself. *b Is there a God besides me? yea there is no God, I know not any.* And we who believe in him, and desire to enjoy him, need for that end to know no other God but him, *c for this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God: * as certainly one as God.*

It is necessary thus to believe the Unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious subjection, we may learn to know whose that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our mindes should wander and fluctuate in our worship about various and uncertain objects. If we should apprehend more Gods then one, I know not what could terminate us in any instant to the actual adoration of any one: for where no difference doth appear, (as, if there were many, and all by nature, Gods, there could be none) what inclination could we have, what reason could we imagine, to preferre or elect any one before the rest for the object of our devotions? Thus is it necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of us who are oblig'd to worship him.

*one by way of Species comprehending many individuals, neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes: but he is so one, as no Unity like his is to be found in the world. Moses Maim. de Fundam. Legis. Quod autem diximus Orientis Ecclesias tradere unum Patrem Omnipotentem, & unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universitate: verbi gratia, si quis dicat unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit, potest enim & alius homo esse, & tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus & tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur ut alius vel tertius addi non possit, multo magis Deus cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicatur, quod alius non sit. Ruffin. in Symb. a Isa. 45. 5, 6. Deut. 4. 35. 32. 39. Psal. 18. 31. b Isa. 45. 18, 21. 22. Isa. 44. 8. c Job. 17. 3. * Veritas Christiana districte pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est non est: quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcumque non ita fuerit ut esse debeat: Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 2. Deus cum summum magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est, non est. Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicendo, si non unus, non est Deus; sed quia, quem confidentius esse, idem definiamus esse, quod si non est Deus, non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro summum magnum unicum sit necesse est, ergo & Deus unicus erit non aliter Deus, nisi summum magnum, nec aliter summum magnum nisi parem non habens, nec aliter parem non habens, nisi unicus fuerit, ibid.*

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of him who is to be worshipped.

Without this acknowledgement we cannot give unto God the things which are Gods, it being part of the worship and honour due unto God, to accept of no compartner with him. When the Law was given, in the observance whereof the Religion of the Israelites consisted, the first precept was this prohibition, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, and whosoever violateth this, denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the Jews observe. This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God onely. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve*; because he alone is God: him onely shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him onely shalt thou trust, because he onely is our rock and our salvation; to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions, because he onely knoweth the hearts of the children of men. Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is intirely required of him and engaged to him. Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one God: And (or rather therefore) thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not chuse but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness; and therefore if there were more so Gods then one, our love must necessarily be terminated unto more then one, and consequently divided between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof, our cheerfull and ready obedience, which like the child propounded to the judgement of Solomon, as soon as 'tis divided, is destroyed. * *No man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.*

Having thus described the first notion of a God, having demonstrated the Existence and Vnity of that God, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the Article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he saies when he makes his Confession in these words, *I believe in God*, which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus expressed:

Forasmuch, as by all things created is made known the eternal power and Godhead, and the dependency of all limited beings inferre an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universal and overruling wisdom; being this collection is so evident, that all the Nations of the earth have made it, being God hath not onely written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his Deity, by most infallible predictions, and supernatural operations; therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly professe this truth, that *there is a God.*

Again, being a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God, being the intire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the Universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this Unity or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God.*

Exod. 20. 3.
Moses Maimon. de Fund. legis. c. 3.

Matth. 4. 10.

Psal. 62. 2.
2 Chron. 6. 30.

Deut. 6. 4. 5.

* Numerus divinitatis summa ratione constare deberet, vel quoniam & cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur. Ecce enim duos intuens Deos tam pares quam duo summa magna; quid facerem si ambos colerem? vereretur ne abundantia officii superstitio potius quam religio crederetur: quia duos tam pares & in altero ambos possem in uno demereri: hoc ipso testimonium præstans parilitati & unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero venerer, dum in uno mihi duo sunt. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 5. Matth. 6. 24.

I Believe in God the FATHER.

Eph. 4. 5.
1 Cor. 8. 6.

After the Confession of a *Deity*, and assertion of the Divine Unity, the next Consideration is concerning Gods *Paternity*; for that *one God is Father of all, and to us there is but one God, the Father.*

* *Omne Deum qui ab homine colitur necesse est inter solennes ritus & precatio- nes Patrem nuncupari. Non tantum honoris gratia sed & rationis: & quod antiquior est homine, & quod vitam, salutem, victum præstat ut pater. Itaque & Jupiter à precantibus Pater vocatur; & Saturnus, & Janus, & Liber, & cæteri deinceps; Laſtan. de ver. Sap. l. 4. c. 3.*

† *That so frequent in Homer, πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τῶ θεῶν τῶν, eundem-*

que appellans dicit Ennius, Divumque hominumque pater rex: Farr. de L. L. l. 4. as Servius observes of Virgil. à Poeta pene omnibus Diis nomen paternum additur, ut fiant venerabiliores: and before him Lucilius,

Ut nemo sit nostrum, quin pater optimus Divum,

Ut Neptunus pater, Liber, Saturnus pater, Mars.

Janus, Quirinus pater nomen dicatur ad unum. Laſtan. ib.

‡ *As Jupiter, which is Jovis pater, or Ζευπάτερ, otherwise Diespiter, or Διὸπάτερ, and Marspiter, of whom Servius, apud Pontifices Marspiter dicitur; Ene. l. 3. So Semipater for Semo, and Σαρδηνάτης for Sardus the proper Deity of Sardinia: Ptolem. 4 Gen. 2. 4. 5 Job. 38. 28. * ἵριος γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα πατὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ἵριος ὡς. Severus in Job. † Plutarch of Plato, calling God πατήρ πάντων ὡς ἀνθρώπων, says, τῇ μεταφορᾷ χρῆσθαι, ὡς ἀνθρώπων, τὸν αἰὶνον πατέρα ὃν οὐρανὸς κἀχθρῶν. Platon. Quest. & Alcimus, πατήρ δὲ ὁ αἰὶνός αἰὶνός αἰὶνός πάντων. 1 Cor. 8. 6.*

merely

merely natural beings, and irrational agents he is the Creator, of rational, as so, the *Father* also; they are his creatures, these his sons. Hence he is stiled the *a Father of Spirits*, and the blessed Angels, when he laid the foundations of the earth, his sons, *b When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy*; hence Man whom he created after his own image, is called his *c offspring*, and Adam the immediate work of his hands; *d the son of God*; hence may we all cry out with the Israelites taught by the Prophet so to speak, *e Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?* Thus the first and most universal notion of Gods Paternity in a borrowed or Metaphorical sense is founded rather upon Creation than procreation.

Unto this act of Creation is annexed that of Conservation, by which God doth uphold and preserve in being that which at first he made; and to which he gave it's being. As therefore it is the duty of the Parent to educate and preserve the child, as that which had it's being from him; to this paternal education doth give the name of *† Father* unto, and Conservation gives the same to God.

Again, Redemption from a state of misery, by which a people hath become worse then nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of *Generation*, which joyned with love, care, and indulgence in the Redeemer, is sufficient to found a new *Paternity*, and give him another title of a *Father*. Well might Moses tell the people of Israel, now brought out of the land of Egypt from their brick and straw, unto their quails and manna, unto their milk and hony, *f Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?* Well might God speak unto the same people as to *his son even his first-born*. *h Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, Harken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel which are born by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb.* And just is the acknowledgement made by that people instructed by the Prophet, *i Doubtlesse thou art our Father though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name.* And thus another kind of paternal Relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a Restitution or temporal Redemption.

Besides, if to be born causeth a Relation to a *Father*, then to be born again maketh an addition of another: and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a Paternity. Now though we cannot *enter the second time into our mothers womb*, nor passe through the same door into the Scene of life again; yet we believe and are perswaded that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdome of God*. A double birth there is, and the * world consists of two, the first and the second man. And though the incorruptible seed be the word of God, and the dispensers of it in some sence may say, as S. Paul spake unto the Corinthians, *I have begotten you through the Gospel*: yet he is the true Father, whose word it is, and that is God, even *the Father of lights, who of his own will begat us with the word of truth*. Thus *n* *whoever belie-*

¶ So Plutarch
answers the
Question, why
Plato termes
God the Maker
and Father of
all things.

Ἡ τοῖς μὲν θε-
 οῖς τοῖς ζωοποιῶ
 καὶ τοῖς ἀνψω-
 παν πατὴρ ἐστὶ
 ποιητὴς δὲ τοῖς
 ἀλόγων καὶ ἀ-
 ψύχων; Fa-
 ther of Gods
 and men, Ma-
 ker of things
 inanimate and
 irrational.

ὁ γὰρ ἡρώδης ἐ-
πὶ Χρυσοπαιῶ
πατέρειαν ἐχού-
σας τὸν πατε-
ρίαν τὸ σπέρ-
μα καὶ περὶ ἐν
τῇ σκηνῇ ματ-
ηροῦ.

Non enim agri pater, si Chryſippo credimus, is dicitur qui eum confevit, quam e femine deinde fruges nascantur: *as the Latine Translation* most absurdly: *for there is neither corn nor field nor any feed belonging to them in the words of Plutarch. Εν Χειρι (not χειρι) is the Secunda, the coat (or rather coats in the acception of Chryſippus and the language of those times) in which the fortus is in-*

volved in the mothers womb. Though therefore both the *Secunda* and the *Fœtus* be made of the seed of the male in the Philosophy of *Chryippus*, yet he is not called the father of the after-birth but of the child, the one being endued with life and reason, and the other not. *a* Heb. 12. 9. *b* Job 38. 7. *c* Acts 17. 28. *d* Luk. 3.

37. e Malach. 2. 10. + So Eustathius observes out of an ingenious Etymologist. Πατήρ τὸν μὲν αἰετὸν πᾶν τῶν αἰδωμένων θεῶν αἰετὸς τοῖς ἀσπίδας τῶν αἰώνων. Il. 6. f Dent. 32. 6. g Exod. 4. 22. h Ifa. 44. 24. 46. 3. i Ifa. 63. 16. k Job. 3. 3. * Totum hominum genus quodammodo sunt homines duo, primus & secundus. Prop. 11 Cor. 4. 15. m Jam. 1. 8. Ioh. 5. 1.

yeth

1 Pet. I. 3, 4.

" Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God ; that we the sons of disobedient and

¶ *Cati Inst.* 2. *Tit.* 5. §. 4. Spadones autem qui generare non possunt, adoptare possunt, & licet filios generare non possint, quos adoptaverunt filios habere possunt, *Ulp. tit.* §. 6. Hi qui generare non possunt, velut spado, utroque modo possunt adoptare. Idem juxta est in cœlibe, *Theoph. tit.* 11. *πυθὼν ἐκ ἐχθρῆς παιδὸς διὰ τὸ μὴ ἰσθῆναι θῆ γάμων, ἢ ἰσθῆναι μὴ, καὶ ἀπαδοποιῶναι δὲ ἢ ἀπαδοποιῶναι μὴ, ἀποβλέπονται δὲ πάντες, τὸ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ἰλασθῆναι ἢ τὸ Συμβαλὼν δυσγύμνα βυλῶναι, ὁππότερῃσιν ἔλαβον ἐκ ἐχθροῦσιν πνῆ.* *Leonis Novell.* 27. τοῖς ἀπύχνης ἀπειδίαν λύει βυλῶναι τοὺς δυσγύμνα νόμος ὑπότιθεσθαι πολεμίας, καὶ γυνῆν ἐκείνην κείνη, ὃ μὴ ὁππότερ λαβὼν περὶ τῆς φύσεως. *1 Iob. 3. 1.*

condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by adoption; that we who were aliens, strangers and enemies, should be assumed ^a unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, on whom all the ^{*} family of heaven and earth is named, and be made partakers of ^b the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the Saints. For as in the legal adoption, the Father hath as [†] full and absolute power over his adopted son, as over his own issue; so in the spiritual, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. He then who hath ^c predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, hath thereby another kind of paternal relation, and so we receive the ^d Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father.

The necessity of this faith in God as in our Father appeareth, first in that it is the ground of all our filial fear, honour, and obedience due unto him upon this relation. ^e Honour thy Father is the first Commandment with promise, written in tables of stone with the finger of God; and, Children obey your parents in the Lord, is an Evangelical precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; for this is right, saith S. Paul. And if there be such a rational and legal obligation of honour and obedience to the fathers of our flesh, how much more must we think our selves obliged to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and everlasting Father? ^f A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear, saith the Lord of hosts? If we be heirs, we must be co-heirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the onely begotten: but being he came not to doe his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as doe the same; as he hath said, ^g Whosoever shall doe the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother. If it be required of a Bishop in the Church of God, to be ^h one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid, unto the father of the family?

The same Relation in the object of our faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that he cannot help us; but comprehended all in this Relation, ⁱ when ye pray, say, Our Father. This prevents all vain repetitions of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all tautology; for ^k our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him. This creates a clear assurance of a grant without mistake of our petition: ^l What man is there of us, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will give him a serpent? If we then who are evil know how to give good gifts unto our children, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

Again this paternity is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetning all afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections. ^m We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we

^a Eph. 3. 15.

^{*} In alienam

familiam

transitus, is

the description

in Agellius l.

5. 19. Cum

in alienam

familiam in-

que libero-

rum locum

extranei su-

munantur, aut

per prætorum

fit, aut per

populum.

quod per

prætorum fit,

adoptio dici-

tur; quod

per populum,

arrogatio. ib.

^b Eph. 1. 18.

[†] As appears

out of the form

of Rogation

yet extant in

this manner,

Velitis, jube-

atis, Quiri-

tes, uti Luci-

us Valerius

Lucio Titio

tam jure lege-

que Filius si-

bi fiet, quam

si ex eo patre

matreque fa-

milias ejus

natus esset,

utique ei vi-

tae necisque

in eo potestas

fiet, uti patri

endo filio

est: ib.

^c Eph. 1. 5.

^d Rom. 8. 15.

^e Eph. 6. 1, 2.

^f Malach. 8. 6.

^g Mat. 12. 50.

^h 1 Tim. 3. 4.

ⁱ Luk. 11. 2.

^k Mat. 6. 8.

^l Mat. 7. 8, 9,

10.

^m αὐτὸν πατέρα

συστήνοντα

ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ τὰ χεῖρα ἀντιπαραστήσαντα ἡμῖν. Zenob. "Ὁς αὐτὸν πατέρα συστήνοντα ἀντιπαραστήσαντα. Lycophron. in Heb. 12. 9, 10. Quod si à Domino nonnulla credimus incuti, cui magis patientiam quam Domino præbeamus? Quin insuper gratulari & gaudere nos docet dignatione divinæ castigationis. Ego, inquit, quos diligo, castigo. O servum illum beatum, cujus emendationi Dominus instat, cui dignatur irasci, quem admonendi dissimulatione non decipit! Tertul. de Pat.

c Psal. 103. 13.

g I *Pes.* 1. 15.
actus indicen
nomen genu,

g 1 Pet. 1. 15. h Mat. 5. 44, 45. vide S. Aug. in Psalm. 100: i Luke 6. 36. Similitudinem patris
actus indicent: sobolis: similitudo operis similitudinem indicet generis: actus nomen confirmet, ut
nomen genus demonstret. Aug. de Temp. Ser. 76.

on God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. *k I ascend unto my father, and your father*, saith our Saviour; the same of both, but in a different manner, denoted by the Article prefixed before the one and not the other: which distinction in the original we may preserve by this translation, *I ascend unto the father of me, and father of you; first of me, and then of you*: not therefore his, because ours, but therefore ours, because his. So far we are the sons of God, as we are like unto him; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likeness of his Son. *I For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.* He the first-born, and we sons, as brethren unto him: he *m appointed heir of all things, and we heirs of God, as joynr heirs with him.* Thus God *n sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of Sons.* And because *we are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba Father.* By his mission we are adopted, and by his Spirit call we God our Father. So are we no longer *o servants, but now Sons; and if Sons, then heirs of God, but still through Christ.* 'Tis true indeed, that *p both he that sanctifieth, that is, Christ, and they who are sanctified, that is, faithful Christians, are all of one, the same father, the same God; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren*: yet are they ** not all of him after the same manner, not the q many Sons like the Captain of their salvation.* But Christ the beloved, the first-born, the onely begotten, the Son after a more peculiar and more excellent manner; the rest with relation unto, and dependence on his Sonship, as given unto him; *Behold I and the children which God hath given me; as being so by faith in him: f For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, as receiving the right of sonship from him: t For as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.* || Among all the sons of God there is none like to that one Son of God: and if there be so great a disparity in the filiation, we must make as great a difference in the correspondent relation. There is one degree of sonship founded on Creation, and that is the lowest, as belonging unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that there is grounded upon Regeneration, or Adoption, belonging onely to the truly faithful in this life: and a third above the rest founded on the Resurrection, or Collation of the eternal inheritance, and the Similitude of God, appertaining to the Saints alone in the world to come: For *u we are now the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him.* And there is yet another degree of filiation, of a greater eminency and a different nature, appertaining properly to none of these, but to the true Son of God alone, who amongst all his brethren hath onely received the title of his ** own*

k Ioh: 20. 17. ἀναβάντος πατρὸς & πατὸς μου. Had πατὸς in both places had its article, there would have seemed two fathers: had the article been prefixed to πατὸς ἡμῶν, he would have seemed first ours, then Christ's, but being prefixed to πατὸς μου, it shews God to be principally and originally Christ's, and by our reference unto him, our father. πατὸς μου μὴ κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ χάριν, & πατὸς ἡμῶν διὰ χάριν, & τῆ ὑπόστασις. Epiphanius. Hæres. 69. § 55. ἐκ ἐποπτείας πατρὸς & πατὸς ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ χάριν, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ πατὸς ἡμῶν, ὡς κατὰ φύσιν, ἐστὶ ἡ ἀναγκαζομένη καὶ πατὸς ἡμῶν, ὡς κατὰ χάριν. S. Cyril. Catech. 7. Ἐπίσης οὖν αὐτὸ πατὸς καὶ ἡμῶν; ἵνα μὴ οὖν.

*εἰ γὰρ τὸν δικαίον ἱερέα θεὸς καὶ τὸν ἀλλαν ἀνθρώπου, ποῦ μὲν οὖν τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἡμῶν. Ἐποπτεῖ γὰρ πατὴρ, Ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἵνα μὴ διὰ τὸν ἰσὺν ἡ φαντασθῶσι, δέκνυσσι τὸ ἀνακαλῶμεν. S. Chrysos. ad locum. I Rom. 8. 29. m Heb. 1. 2. n Gal. 4. 5, 6. Hoc facit Deus ex filiis hominum filios Dei, quia ex filio Dei fecit Deus filium hominis. S. Aug. in Psal. 52. o Galat. 4. 7. p Heb. 2. 11. * Dicimur & filii Dei, sed ille aliter filius Dei. S. Aug. in Psal. 88. t si quis dicitur ὁ θεὸς πολλὰ μὴ καταχρηστικῶς πατὴρ, ἵνα ἡ μὴ φύσις καὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ μονογενὲς εἶναι. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 7. q Heb. 2. 10. r Isai. 8. 18. Heb. 2. 13. f Gal. 3. 26. t Ioh. 1. 12. || Ergo nemo in filiis Dei similis erit filio Dei. Et ipse dictus est filius Dei, & nos dicti in illo unum. Ille natus, nos adoptati: Ille ab æterno filius unigenitus per naturam, nos à tempore facti per gratiam. S. Aug. Psal. 88. u I Ioh. 3. 2. * Rom. 8. 32. Ut magnificentia Dei dilectionis ex comparationis genere nosceretur, non peperisse Patrem proprio filio suo docuit. Nec unquam adoptandis adoptato, neque pro creatis creaturæ: sed pro alienis suo, pro connumerandis proprio. Hilari. l. 6. de Trin.*

E Son,

9 Matt. 3. 17.
and 17. 5.

Anne ibi in
eo quod di-
citur, *Hic est*,
non hoc si-
gnificare vi-
detur: alios
quidem cog-
nominatos
ab eo filios;
sed hic filius
meus est;
Donavi ado-
ptionis plu-
rimis no-
men; sed iste
mihi filius
est & id.

7 John 5. 18.
πατέρι δὲ τῷ
ἰσχυρῷ τῷ θεῷ. as
Rom. 8. 32.
ὅς γὰρ τὸ ἰδίον υἱὸς
ἐκ ἰσχυροῦ.

12 Cor. 11. 31.

† Non sicut
Christi pa-
ter, ita & no-
stri pater.

Nunquam e-
nim Christus
ita nos con-
iunxit, ut
nullam di-
stinctionem
faceret inter
nos & se. Ille
enim filius
æqualis pa-
tri, ille æter-
nus cum pa-
tre, patrique
coæternus.

Nos autem
facti per fi-
lium, ado-
ptati per uni-
cum. Pro-
inde nun-
quam audi-

tum est de ore Domini nostri Jesu Christi, cum ad discipulos loqueretur, dixisse illum de Deo sum-
mo patre suo, Pater noster; sed aut Pater meus dixit, aut Pater vester; usque adeo ut quodam loco
poneret hæc duo; *Vado ad Deum meum*, inquit, & *Deum vestrum*. Quare non dixit Deum nostrum?
& patrem meum dixit, & patrem vestrum, non dixit nostrum. Sic jungit ne distinguat, sic distinguit
ut non sejungat. Unum nos vult esse in se, unum autem patrem & se. S. August. in Joan. Tract. 21.
& Matth. 28. 13, 19. * Arius and Euzoius, in their Creed delivered to Constantine: *Τὸν τὸν τὸν πα-
τὴρ ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι ἀσώκῳ, ἀσώκῳ τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ ἰαννῷ μακρῶς, ποσὶθεντος μακρῶς πᾶν τὸ ἴδιον,
κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν εἰς ὅμοιαν τὴν πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ αἰὶν πνεῦμα*. Socrat. l. 1. c. 26. And upon
the exhibiting this Confession of faith, they were restored to the Communion of the Church by the Synod of
Jerusalem. Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. In the same manner Eusebius delivered his Creed unto the Council of Nice,
concluding and deducing it from the same text; καὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς ἀποστείλας εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τὸς ἰαννῷ
μακρῶς ἐκ τῆς ποσὶθεντος μακρῶς, &c. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. Theodor. l. 1. c. 12. The same is also al-
leged by the Council of Antioch, under the Emperour Constantius, and Pope Julius. Socrat. l. 2. c. 10. Vide
S. Athanas. in Epist. ad ubique Orihod. Oras. contra Gregales Sabellii, & contra Arianos, ex Deo Deus.
vide Basil. de Sp. S. n. Act. 8. 36, 37. n. v. 12. 7 Act. 2. 38. and 8. 16. and 10. 48. and 19. 5.

stitution,

Son, and a singular testimony from heaven, 9 *This is my beloved Son*, even in the presence of John the Baptist, even in the midst of Moses and Elias, (who are certainly the sons of God by all the other three degrees of filiation) and therefore hath called God after a peculiar way & his own father. And so at last we come unto the most singular and eminent paternal relation, *I unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore*; the Father of him and of us, but not the Father of us as † of him. Christ hath taught us to say, *Our Father*: a form of speech which he never used himself: sometimes he calls him *the Father*, sometimes *my Father*, sometimes *your*, but never *our*; he makes no such conjunction of us to himself, as to make no distinction between us and himself: So conjoining us as to distinguish, though so distinguishing as not to separate us.

Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of Gods Pater-
nity, so the original and proper explication of this Article of the Creed: and that not onely because the Ancient Fathers deliver no other exposition of it: but also because that which I conceive to be the first occasion, rise, and original of the Creed it self, requireth this as the proper interpretation. Immediately before the ascension of our Saviour, he said unto his Apostles, * *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost*. From this sacred form of Baptisme, did the Church derive the * Rule of Faith, requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their name. When the Eunuch asked Philip, * *what doth hinder me to be baptized?* Philip said, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*: And when the Eunuch replied, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God: be baptized him*. And before that, the Samaritans, * *when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women*. For as in the Acts of the Apostles there is no more expressed then that they baptized, *in the name of Jesus Christ*: so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, then to believe in the same name. But being the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first Institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain that from the Apostles times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the Eunuch said not simply, *I believe in the Son*, but, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, as a brief explication of that part of the In-

stitution, which he had learned before of Philip: So they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easy and familiar way, which when they had rendred, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being regularly and constantly used, made up the Rule of Faith, that is, the *Creed*. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any, who shall seriously consider the constant practise of the Church, from the first Age unto this present, of delivering the Rule of Faith to those which were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves, or their Sureties, an expresse recitation, profession or acknowledgement of the *Creed*. From whence this observation is properly deduceable; That in what sense the name of *Father* is taken in the Form of Baptisme, in the same it also ought to be taken in this Article. And being nothing can be more clear, then that, when it is said, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son*, the notion of *Father* hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joyned with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that *Father*, but that onely-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the father of that onely-begotten: it followeth, that the proper explication of the first words of the *Creed* is this; *I believe in God the Father of Christ Iesus*.

In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the *Creed*, whereby the Father is considered both personally, and essentially: personally, as the first in the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father, is evident, not onely out of the Original, but also from the very letter of the *Creed*, which teacheth us to *believe in God the Father, and in his Son*; for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father of himself. As therefore when I say, *I believe in Iesus Christ his Son*, I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first Article; so when I said, *I believe in God the Father*, I must as necessarily be understood of the Father of him, whom I call *his Son* in the second Article.

Now as it cannot be denied that God may several wayes be said to be the Father of Christ: First, as he was begotten by the ^a Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; Secondly, as he was sent by him with special authority, as the ^b King of Israel; Thirdly, as he was ^c raised from the dead, out of the womb of the earth unto immortal life, and made heir of all things in his fathers house: So must we not doubt but, beside all these, God is the Father of that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was ^d with God, and God: which shall be demonstrated fully in the second Article, when we come to shew how Christ is the onely-begotten Son. And according unto this Paternity by way of generation totally divine, in which he who begetteth is God, and he which is begotten, the same God, do we believe in God, as the eternal Father of an eternal Son. Which relation is coæval with his essence: so that we are not to imagine one without the other; but as we professe him alwayes God, so must we acknowledge him ^e alwayes *Father*, and that in a far more

ergo filium fuisse credas, ne patrem semper non fuisse blasphemēs. *Id. Sermon. 62*: Adverte, quod cum Dei Patris nomen in Confessione conjungit, ostendit quod non ante Deus esse coepit, & postea pater, sed sine ullo initio & Deus semper, & pater est. *Aug. de Temp. Sermon. 132*.

† Pater cum audis, Filii intellige patrem, qui filius supradictæ sit imago substantiæ.

Ruff. in Syn. a Luke 1. 35. b John 10. 35. 36. and 1. 49. c Act. 13. 32, 33.

d John 1. 1: * αὐτὸς πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς πατὴρ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ υἱός. τὸ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς, καὶ υἱὸς πατὴρ.

S. Cyril. Dial. de Trin. 2.

Πατὴρ δὲ καὶ υἱός, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς πατὴρ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ υἱός.

Epiph. Hæres. 62.

Sicut nunquam fuit non Deus, ita nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo filius natus.

Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm.

c. 1. Credimus in Deum, eundem confitemur Patrem, ut eundem semper habuisse filium nos credamus.

Chrysost. Sermon. 59.

Inest Deo pietas, est in Deo semper affectio, paternitas permanet apud illum: semper

Naz: Orat. 35:
patri; tamen
negari ejusdem
a. 2. ad qua
Theodor. l. 2.
πατρι ὁμοίαν αἰ
ἡ ὁμοίᾳ τῇ κατὰ
τῆς φύσεως δ

Now that privilege or || priority consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater then the essence or attributes of the others; (for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both) but onely in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he acknowledgeth that he is *from him*, that he *liveth by him*, that the *father gave him to have life in himself*, and generally refer-

Naz.: Orat. 35. * Etiam filius hominis homo in quibusdam similibus, in quibusdam sit dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiae est, negari versus filius non potest, & qua vero est filius negari ejusdem substantiae non potest. S. Aug., l. 9. cont. Max. c. 15. vide Tho. Summ. p. I. q. 83.
n. 2. ad quart. v. Gen. I. 28. * Gen. 5. 3. * αὐτὸ τὸ ὅμοιον τοῦ πατρὸς γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ Syn. Sardic.
Theodori. I. 2. c. 8. Infinitur nobis in Patre autoritas, in filio nativitas. S. Aug. † τὸ μὴ ἀφ' οὗτος
πατέρ εἶναι καὶ φιλανθρωπία, καὶ ταύτην τὴν σήμερον αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἀποκαταστήσει. Alexandr. apud Theodosios. l. I. c. 4.
ἐμπερίεστι δὲ χριστὸς μὴ τὰν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑψίστου χρόνου ἀρρογιστάμενον τὸν υἷον τοῦ πατρὸς φαμέν. κενά
† τίς φύσις διαφέρει ἑτέρας. S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. I. γ John 7. 19. γ John 6. 57. γ John 5. 26.

reth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the Ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, *the father is greater then I*, of Christ as the Son of God, as the second person in the blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his essence, but his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who onely hath it of himself, and is the original of all power and essence in the Son. *I can of mine own self do nothing*, saith our Saviour,* because he is not of himself; and whosoever receives his being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are. *The Son then can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do*, because he hath no † power of himself, but what the Father gave; and being he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire and undivided essence, therefore *what things soever he doth, these also doth the son likewise*, by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to any thing then the Life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable, that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King*, saith

b John 14.28.

μεῖζον εἶπεν. ὁ
μειζον τῷ υἱῷ
χρῆμα. ἀλλὰ
διὰ τὴν ἰσχύα
τὴν πατρὸς
ἐκείνου.

S. Athanas.

contra Arianos, l. 2.

Δεῖται τὸν υἱὸν

κατὰ τὴν τῆς

αἰτίας λόγον ἐν

ταύτῃ τῷ μεῖζον

λέγει. ἰππεδὶ

γὰρ δὴ τὸν πα-

τρὸς ὁ υἱὸς τῷ

υἱῷ, κατὰ τὸν

μεῖζον ὁ πα-

τήρ, οὗτος αἰνῶ

καὶ ἀρχῆ, διὸ

καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ

πατήρ, ὁ πατήρ μὲν

μεῖζον μὲν ἵσ,

καὶ πατήρ δι-

δοῦται. τὸ δὲ πα-

τήρ τὸ αἶμα Ca-

maives, ὁ υἱὸς τὸ αἶμα εἶναι καὶ ἀρχὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ. S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1. And the same S. Basil doth not onely acknowledge this to be true in respect of the Divine Nature of Christ, but shinketh the Divinity of the Son may be prov'd from hence. *Εἰς δὲ καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ φωνῇ, τὸ ἰσοῦσιν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί διηλεκτὰν πατρὶσιν.* τὰς γὰρ συγκρίσεις διὰ καὶ καὶ, ὅτι τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως γινώσκοντες, ἀφ' ὧν γὰρ ἀγέλα λήγονται μεῖζον, καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπου διακρίσιν, καὶ ἁνὸν πλὴν ταχέστερον, ὁ τῶν αἰ συγκρίσεων τὸν τῶν ἰσοῦσιν γινώσκοντες, μεῖζον δὲ κατὰ συγκρίσεις ἱερῶν πατὴρ τῷ υἱῷ, ἰσοῦσιν τῷ πατρί ὁ υἱός. Ad Caesarienses Ep. 141. τὸ μεῖζον μὲν ἵσ τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἵσ τῆς φύσεως. Nazian. Orat. 36. & Orat. 40. ὁ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ μεῖζον, κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν δὲ. vide Epiph. in Ancor. c. 17. εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις μεῖζον εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ αἰνῶ τῷ υἱῷ, ὅτι τὸν ἀντιθέμενον. S. Chrys. Homil. in Joan. 75. Ideo totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est à seipso, sed à Patre. *Æqualis est enim Patri, sed hoc quoque accepit à Patre.* S. Aug. Epist. 66. Necesse est quodammodo prior sit qua Pater sit. Quoniam antecedit necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem, quia nascitur. Novatianus. Major itaque Pater filio est, & plane major, cui tantum donat esse, quantus ipse est, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat. S. Hilary. de Trinit. l. 9. Non præstantem quencquam cuiquam genere substantiæ, sed subiectum alterum alteri nativitate naturæ: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod filius sit. Id. de Synod. contra Arianos. Quis Patrem non potius confitebitur ut ingentum à genito, ut Patrem à filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus est, ut volentem ab ipso qui obediatur? & ipse nobis testis est, *Pater major me est.* Id. de Trin. l. 3. In eo quod in sese sunt Dei, ex Deo divinitatem cognosce; in eo vero quod Pater major est, confessionem paternæ autoritatis intellige. Id. l. 11. And before all these, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria; τὸ δὲ ἀξίον τῷ πατρί μόνον ἰδιωμα πατρὸς διέξαστον, αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ φάσκοντες τὸν Πατέρα, ὁ πατήρ μὲν μεῖζον μὲν ἵσ. Theodor. Hist. l. 1. c. 4. Lastly, we have the Testimony of Photius, that many of the ancient Fathers so expounded it. τὸν δὲ πατήρ μὲν μεῖζον μὲν ἵσ. τὸ ἰσχυρὸν φωνῇ, διακρίσεις δὲ πατρὸς ἰσχυρὸν ἰσχυρῶς. ὁ μὲν γὰρ φωνῇ τῷ αἰτίῳ μεῖζον εἰρηδύει. Epist. 176. *Æqualis Patri, sed major Pater, quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia, & causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, ut isto modo sit.* Victor. Afer. l. 1. Pater, inquit, major me est, merito major, quia solus hic auctor sine auctore est. Theodadius. c. John 5. 30, 19. * Quicquid filius habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut filius sit; quia à Patre habet ut possit; quia à patre habet ut sit. S. Aug. Tract. 20. in Joan. † Non alia potentia est in filio, & alia substantia; sed ipsa est potentia quæ substantia: substantia ut sit, potentia ut possit. Ergo quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, *non potest Filius à se facere quicquam*; quia non est filius à se, ideo non potest à se. Ib. Totum quod est, de Patre est; totum quod potest, de Patre est; quoniam quod potest & est, de Patre totum est. Ibid. Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem: quia de Patre est totus Filius, & tota substantia & potentia ejus ex illo est qui genuit eum. Id. Tract. 21. Et primum Filium cognosce, cum dicitur, *Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem.* Habes nativitatem Filii, quæ ab se nihil potest facere nisi videat. In eo autem quod à se nihil potest, innascibilitatis admittit errorem. Ab se enim non potest posse nativitas. S. Hilary. de Trin. l. 7. Dum non à se facit, ad id quod agit secundum nativitatem sibi Pater auctor est. Id. l. 11. Autorem discrevit, cum ait, *Non potest à se facere*: Obsequentiam significat, cum addit, *Nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem.* Id. de Synod. Afer. 10, 10.

^a *Thef. 1. 9.*
^{*} *Joan. 1. 26.*
 Sicut habet
 Pater vitam
 in semetipso,
 sic dedit &
 Filio vitam
 habere in se-
 metipso: ut
 hoc solum
 interfuit in-
 ter Patrem
 & Filium,
 quia Pater
 habet vitam
 in semetipso
 quam nemo
 ei dedit, Fi-
 lius autem
 habet vitam
 in semetipso
 quam Pater
 dedit. *S. Aug.*
Tract. 19. in
Joh. Incom-
mutabilis est
vita Filii si-
cut & Patris,
& tamen de
Patre est: &
inseparabilis

the Prophet Jeremy, and S. Paul putteth the Thessalonians in mind, how they ^a turned from idols to serve the living and true God. Now life is otherwise in God then in the creatures: in him originally, in them derivatively; in him as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependence and participation: our life is in him, but his is in himself; and ^{*} as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself: † both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, as the one, so the other; but onely with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he professeth of himself, that the living Father sent him, and that he liveth by the Father.

We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve our selves in the darknesse of this mystery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father; whose preeminence undeniably consisteth in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himself, and that there is no other person who is God, but is God of him. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much: but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some preeminence, where there is place for derogation. ^{*} What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from him: what the first is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so onely in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

est operatio Patris & Filii; sed tamen ita operari Filio de illo est, de quo ipse est, id est, de Patre. *Id. de Trin. 1. 2. c. 1.* † Sicut habet, dedit; qualem habet, dedit; quantam habet, tantam dedit. *Id. contra Maxim. 1. 3. c. 14.* Ergo quod dicitur dedit filio, tale est ac si diceretur, genuit filium, generando enim dedit ut esset, sic dedit ut vita esset, & sic dedit ut in semetipso vita esset. *Id. Tract. 22. in Joh.* Tali confessione originis suæ indiscretæ naturæ perfecta nativitas est. Quod enim in utroque vita est, id in utroque significatur essentia, & vita quæ generatur ex vita, id est, essentia quæ de essentia nascitur, dum non dissimilis nascitur scilicet, quia vita ex vita est, tenet in se indissimilem naturam originis suæ, quia & natæ & gignentis essentia, id est, vitæ quæ habetur & data est similitudo non discrepet: *S. Hilar. de Synod. advers. Arianos.* Quia ergo apparet vita Patris hoc esse quod ipse est; sicut habet vitam in se, sic dedit: sic dedit Filio habere vitam, id est, sic est esse Filii, sicut esse Patris. *Vigil. Africanus Disput.* In vita naturæ & essentia significatio est, quæ sicut habetur, ita data esse docetur ad habendum. *S. Hilar. ib.* ¶ Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quod ex Patre Filius est: propter Patrem, quod eructatum est verbum ex Patris corde, quod à Patre processit, quod ex paterno generatus est utero, quod fons Pater Filii est, quod radix Pater Filii est. *S. Ambros. de Fide, 1. 4. c. 5.* ^{*} Pater de nullo patre, Filius de Deo Patre, Pater quod est, à nullo est; quod autem Pater est, propter Filium est. Filius vero & quod filius est, propter Patrem est, & quod est, à Patre est. *S. Aug. Tract. 19. in Joh.* Filium dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifestum est quod Filius habet alium de quo sit, & cui Filius est; Pater autem non filium de quo sit habeat, sed cui Pater sit. Omnis enim filius de patre est quod est, & patri filius est: nullus autem pater de filio est quod est, sed filio pater est. *Id. de Trin. 1. 2. c. 1.* Filius non hoc tantum habet nascendo ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit. *Ib. 1. 5. c. 14.* Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsam substantiam nascendo habet. *Ibid. c. 15.* Pater non habet patrem de quo sit, Filius autem de Patre est ut sit, atque ut illi coæternus sit. *Ibid. 1. 6. c. 10.* Ab ipso, inquit, sum; quia filius de Patre, & quicquid est filius, de illo est cujus est filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo; & dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen: ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, Ab ipso sum. *Id. Tract. in Joh. 31.* Pater non est si non habeat Filium, & Filius non est si non habeat Patrem: sed tamen Filius Deus de Patre, Pater autem Deus, sed non de Filio: Pater Filii, non Deus de Filio; ille autem Filius Patris, & Deus de Patre. *Id. Tract. 30. in Joh.* Hoc tamen inter Patrem & Filium interest, quia Pater à nullo hoc accepit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Patris accepit. *Ambr. in Epist. ad Eph. c. 7.* Est ergo Deus Pater omnium, institutor & creator, solus originem nesciens. *Novat. de Trinit. c. 31.* whereas he speaks after of the Son, Est ergo Deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitus, ut esset Deus. Pater est Deus de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus. *S. Aug. Epist. 66.*

Upon this preeminence (as I conceive) may safely be grounded the congruity of the Divine Mission. We often read that Christ was sent, from whence he bears the name of an *Apostle* himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the *Father sent him, so sent he them*: The Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son; but we † never read that the Father was sent at all, there being an * authority in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission. In the Parable *b a certain householder which planted a Vineyard, first sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants, but last of all he sent unto them his Son*: it had been inconsistent even with the literal sense of an historical parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customs of men, to have said, that last of all, the Son sent his Father to them. So God placing man in the Vineyard of his Church, first sent his servants the prophets, by whom he *c spake at sundry times and in divers manners*; but in the last dayes he sent his Son: and it were as † incongruous and inconsistent with the divine generation, that the Son should send the Father into the world. *d As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father*, saith our Saviour; intimating, that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him, because he lived by him, laying his generation as the proper ground of his mission. Thus he which begetteth sendeth, and he which is ‖ begotten is sent. *e For I am from him, and he hath sent me*, saith the Son: from whom I received my essence by communication, from him also received I this commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give then to receive, to send then to be sent; so in respect of the Sonship there is some priority in the divine Paternity: from whence divers of the † Ancients read that place of S. John with this addition, *f the Father (which sent me) is greater then I*. He then is that *g God who sent forth his Son made of a woman*, that *God who hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba Father*. So that the authority of sending is in the Father: which therefore ought to be acknowledged, because upon this mission is founded the highest testimony of his love to man, for *herein is love*, saith S. John, *not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*.

Heb. 3. 1.

Ioan. 10. 21.

† Pater enim solus natus, quam legitur missus. S. Aug. 1. 2. de Trinit. c. 5.

* Solus Pater non legitur missus, quia solus non habet auctoritatem à quo genitus sit, vel à quo procedat. Et ideo non propter naturæ diversitatem, sed propter ipsam auctoritatem, solus Pater non dicitur missus: non enim splendor aut fervor ignem, sed ignis mittit sive splendorem sive fervorem. S. Aug. Serm. cont. Arian. c. 4. Qui mittit, potestatem

suam in eo quod mittit ostendit. S. Hilar. 1. 8. *b* Matth. 21. 33. *c* Heb. 1. 1. † Si voluisset Deus Pater per subjectam creaturam visibiliter apparere, absurdissime tamen aut à Filio quem genuit, aut à Spiritu Sancto qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur. S. Aug. de Trinit. 1. 4. cap. ult. *d* Ioan. 6. 57. † Filius est igitur à Patre missus, non Pater à Filio, quia Filius est à Patre natus, non Pater à Filio. Fulgent. 1. 8. contra Fabianum, in Collect. Theodul. de S. S. Quis autem Christianus ignorat quod Pater miserit, missusque sit Filius? Non enim genitorem ab eo quem genuit, sed genitum à genitore mitti oportebat. S. Aug. contra Maxim. 1. 3. c. 14. Ubi audis, ipse me misit, noli intelligere naturæ dissimilitudinem, sed generantis auctoritatem. Id. Tract. 31. in Ioh. Ἐνταῦθα ἐν ὁ δὲ ἀποστείλας καὶ ὁ ἀποσταλόμενος, ἵνα δὲ εἴη τὸ πάντως ἀγαθὸν μὴν ἀγαθὸν τὸν πατέρα, πάντες τὸν πατέρα. Epiph. Hæres. 69. 54. Hence the language of the Schools, Missio importat processionem originis, as Thom. Aquin. 10. q. 43. ar. 1. ad primum; or auctoritatem principii, as Durand. 1. 1. dist. 15. q. 1. Io. 7. 29. † Αἰγύπτου γὰρ τὸ πρὶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ οὕτως ἱερομνημονεύει: ὅτι ὁ ἀποστείλας καὶ πατὴρ μέζων καὶ ἐστὶ, saith Epiphanius of the Arians; and answering, grants in these words which follow, καὶ ἀρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἀποστείλας καὶ πατὴρ φάσκει, καὶ ἐχὼ ὁ κρείσσων καὶ Hæres. 69. 53. To the same purpose Athanas. de Hum. Nat. Susc. & Cyril. Thesau. 1. 11. read it ὁ πατέρας καὶ πατὴρ, and S. Basil makes Eunomius read it so, in his first book against him, and with that addition answers it. So the second Confession of the Council of Sirmium, both in the Latin original, and Greek Translation. S. Hilar. de Syn. S. Athanas. & Socr. 1. 2. c. 3. f Io. 14. 28. *g* Gal. 4. 4.

Again

*who have not stuck to call the Father the † origin, ‡ the cause, * the

ἀρχή, μὴ δὲ μὴ ἐκ αὐτοῦ, μὴ δι' αὐτοῦ. ὡς ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀπαρχὴ τῆς ἐκ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπαρχὴς θεογονίας. Naz. Orat. 1. c. 29. μὴ χροστικὴν ἀρχὴν πρὸς ἡμετέραν πρὸς λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ ἀχρονὸν ἀρχὴν γένεσιν καὶ πατέρα. ἀρχὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἀχρονός, ἀκατάληπτος. S. Cyril. Hier. Catech. 11. ἀρχὴ μὴ ἐν πατρὶς ἀδεία. ἀρχὴ δὲ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατρὸς. S. Basil. contra Eunom. 1. 2. Cum dixisset, quem mittet pater, addidit, in nomine meo: non tamen dixit, quem mittet Pater à me, quemadmodum dixit, quem ego mittam vobis à Patre; viz. ostendens quod totius divinitatis, vel, si melius dicitur, Deitatis principium Pater est. S. Aug. de Trin. 1. 4. c. 20. Unum principium ad creaturam dicitur Deus, non duo vel tria principia. Ad se autem invicem in Trinitate, si gignens ad id quod gignitur principium est, Pater ad Filium principium est, quia gignit eum. S. Aug. de Trin. 1. 3. c. 14. Pater ergo principium Deitatis. Genad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 1. In this sense the Greek Fathers used ἀναρχὸς as proper to the Father (in the same notion with ἀρχὴν, with relation to the principium productionis,) and denied it to the Son, 'Ο ὁ υἱός. ἰδὼν μὲν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς λαμβάνει, καὶ ἀναρχὸς, ἀρχὴ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς αἰὶνός. ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν δὸς ἔχειν τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἀναρχὸς. Naz. Orat. 29. εἰ τις ἀρνήσεται καὶ ἀναρχὸν λέγει τὸν υἱόν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀναρχὸς καὶ ὁ ἀρχὴν λέγων, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ θεός, ἀναρχὸς ἔσται. Synod. Sirm. Conf. prima, thus first translated into Latine, Si quis innascibilem, & sine initio dicat filium, tanquam duo sine principio, & duo innascibilia, & duo innata dicens, duos faciet deos, Anathema sit. S. Hilary de Synod. In which sense the Platonists did understand ἀρχὴν of God, ὡς ἐκ ἀρχῆς τῆς λογικῆς οὐκ ἐκ κοσμογένεως, εἰς ἀρχὴν ἐκ μὴ δὸς ἔχειν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ δὸς αἰών, καὶ ὁ κοσμογενὴς καὶ τὸν δὸς ἀρχὴν λέγων. Hierocles de Provid. And the Latines attributing the term principium to the Son, do it with the addition of de, or ex principio. Pater principium non de principio, Filius principium de principio. S. Aug. contra Maxim. 1. 3. c. 17. Principium ex principio & unum est, & initio caret. Faust. Rheg. Epist. 16. Ex ore, inquit, Altissimi prodivi. Hæc est enim nativitas perfecta Sermonis, hoc est principium sine principio, hic est ortus habens initium in nativitate, in statu non habens. Phœbad. contra Arria. Sicut in creaturis invenitur principium primum & principium secundum; ita in personis divinis invenitur principium non de principio, quod est Pater, & principium à principio, quod est Filius. Tho. Aquin. 1. q. 33. ar. 4. And to this all the Schoolmen writing on his Summes agree, as all upon the Sentences; 1. dist. 29. καὶ τὰ ἰσὺν ἢ τὸ θεὸς οὖτος ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἀρχὴ ἀνδράποδος, καὶ τῆς κλίσεως πατρὸς. S. Athanas. Dissert. Orthod. & Anom. ἀλλὰ τις ἐκ δυνάμεως ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀναρχῆς οὐκ οὖτος, ὡς ἐκ αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὄντων ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς δι' ἐκείνου πάντα. S. Basil. Ep. 43. and upon that place, this day have I begotten thee; ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ γινώσκον, τὴν αἰτίαν ἀφ' ἧς ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν ἐκείνου. Id. contra Eunom. 1. 2. πῶς ἐδύναται διαφορὰν καταλείπει, ἰδὼν τὴν ἐκ αἰτίας πρὸς τὰ εἶδη αὐτῶν ἐκπαρκεύσαν. Id. 1. 1. Πρὸς τὸ, ὅτι καὶ ἰδὼν ἐκ τῆς οὐκ ἐκείνου τοῦ πατρὸς μὴ, εἰδὼν καὶ ὅτι ἀρχὴν ἰαυτοῦ καὶ αἰτίαν ὁμογενεῖας, καὶ πατέρα πάντα λέγει. Id. Epist. 64. διαφορὰν ἐκ δυνάμεως ἐκ μόνων τῶν τελευτῶν ἰδιότησι, τῇ ἀναρχίᾳ καὶ πατρικίᾳ, καὶ αἰτιότητι υἱικῇ, καὶ τῇ αἰτιότητι καὶ ἐκπαρκεύσει ὁμογενεῖας. Damasc. 1. 4. c. 5. καὶ πατέρα τὸ λόγος καὶ τῆς σοφίας, καὶ θεογονία τὸ ἀνδράποδος τὸ ἀρχὴ, καὶ πρὸς τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ἀρχὴν φανερὰ τῆς δυνάμεως. Zachar. Mytlen. And although Thomas Aquinas, and Eugenius Bishop of Rome in the definition of the Council of Florence, have observed that the Greeks in this case do use the term of causa, but the Latines only principium; yet the very Latine Fathers in the 25. Sesson of the same Council have these words, μὴν γὰρ ὁ κοινὸς καὶ πατέρα αἰτίαν καὶ πρῶτον, καὶ πρῶτον τῆς δυνάμεως: and we have before cited Victorinus Afer, who says, Pater causa est ipsi filio ut sit. So S. Hilary, Deum nasci, non est aliud quam in ea natura esse qua Deus est, quia nasci cum causam nativitatis ostendat, non displicet tamen in genere auctoris existere. de Trin. 1. 11. Ex Spiritu enim Spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate Spiritus, per quam & ipse Spiritus est, nascatur, nec tamen alia ei preterquam perfectarum atque inde-mutabilium causarum ad id quod nascitur causa est, & ex causa, licet perfecta atque inde-mutabili nascens, necesse est ex causa in causa ipsius proprietate nascatur. Id. 1. 12. Qui ex eo qui est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, qui ejus qui est ad id quod est causa est, non etiam id quod non est origo nascendi est. Ibid. Deus omnium quæ sunt causa est. Quod autem rerum omnium causa est, etiam sapientiæ suæ causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientia sua. Igitur sempiternæ suæ sapientiæ causa est sempiterna. S. Aug. 1. 83. quest. 16. And as they called the Father the cause of the Son, so they accounted it the propriety of the Father to be without a cause; as appears out of Alexander the Bishop of Alexandria's Epist. before produced. * We have cited Phœbadus speaking so before; to which may be added: Si quis igitur adhuc & de Apostolo requirit dominicum statum, id est, singularis substantiæ dualitatem quæ per naturam auctori suo jungitur. & paulo post; Sed cum refertur ex ipso, certe ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium respiciat auctorem. S. Hilary is known to speak frequently of the authority of the Father, as of the author of his Son; and several places have been already collected, especially by Petavius, to which these may be added, besides what have been already produced. Ipso quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit auctor ostenditur. 1. 4. cum potius honor filii dignitas sit paterna, & gloriosus auctor sit ex quo is, qui tali gloria sit dignus, extiterit. Ibid. Aliud est sine auctore esse semper æternum, aliud quod patri, id est, auctori est cœternum. Ubi enim pater auctor, ibi & nativitas est. At vero ubi auctor æternus est, ibi & nativitas æterna est: quia sicut nativitas ab auctore est, ita ab æterno auctore æterna nativitas est. Id. 1. 12. Quod vero ex æterno natum est, id si non æternum natum est, jam non erit & pater auctor æternus. Si quid igitur ei qui ab æterno patre natus est ex æternitate defuerit, id ipsum auctori non est ambiguum defuisse. Ib. Natum non post aliquid, sed ante omnia, ut nativitas tantum testetur auctorem, non præposterum aliquid in se auctore significet. Ib. Natus autem ita, ut nihil aliud quam se sibi significet auctorem. Ib. Ipsi tamen auctor est Pater generando sine initio. Russ. in Symb. Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filio dicis auctorem, quia ille genuit, genitus est ille, quia ille de illo est, non ille de isto, fateor & concedo. S. August. contra Maximin. 1. 3. c. 14.

† Nec dubi-
taverim Fili-
um dicere &
radicis fruti-
cem, & fontis
fluvium, &
solis radium.
Tertull. adv.
Praxeam, c. 8.
Nec frutex
tamen à ra-
dice, nec flu-
vius à fonte,
nec radius à
sole discerni-
tur, sicut nec
à Deo sermo.
Ib. ἵνα μὴ γάρ ὁ
πατήρ τέλειον ἴ-
χου τοῦ εἶναι καὶ
ἀντιθέτως, ἢ ἡ
καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ ὕ-
δατος καὶ τοῦ
πυλῶματος.
S. Basil. Ho-
mil. 26. De-
minus Pater,
quia radix est
Filii. S. Am-
bros. in Luc. 1. 10. c. 1: ut & de Fide 1. 4. c. 5.

author, the † root, the ‖ fountain, and the § head of the Son, or the whole divinity.

For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the person of the Father, of whom are all things, and the person of the Son, by whom are all things. Secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this, That as the branch is from the root, and river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that being which they have; whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river: So the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him, the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none.

Some indeed of the Ancients may seem to have made yet a further difference between the persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation terms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the * Father had; because he was not begotten of himself, the † Father had been so; because he is not the cause of himself, ‖ the Father were. Whereas if we speak properly, God the Father hath * neither his being from another, nor from himself: not from another, that were repugnant to his paternity; not from himself, that were a contradiction in it self. And therefore those expressions are not to be understood positively

ἢ ἀναρχὸς ὁ πατήρ πηγὴ τοῦ τοῦ θεογενετοῦς ποταμοῦ. τὸ μυστηριώδες ὁ πατήρ. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. 11. In hac ergo natura filius est, & in hoc originis fonte subsistens processit ex sapiente sapientia, ex forti virtus, ex lumine splendor. Vigil. Disp. φῶς πνῆμα θεοῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρῶντος, αἰνον αὐτῷ ἔχον, ὡς πηγὴν ἰαντοῦ, καὶ ἀκρίβειαν πηγῶν. Basil. Homil. 28. Αἰνεῖται καὶ τὸ ὕψος αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀπείρητον, κλίβανος, φῶς, ἢ αὐτὸς ὡς ποταμὸς ἐκείνης, ἐκπορεύμενος διανοίας ἐκ τῆς ἀλη-
θεῖας πηγῆς τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς αὐτοῦ πατρὸς διότητος. Aff. Concil. Nic. 1. 2. c. 22. And S. Cyril. of Alexandria. who often useth this expression, gives us the full signification of it, in these words, upon the 1. of S. John. ἀδικησεν ὃ ὅσως ἐδὲν τὸ, ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς, τὸ πατὲρ * ὃν ἀναρχὸν ἐκείνην μόνον γὰρ τὸ ἐξ ὃ τοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκ τῆς οὐρανόθεν οὐρανόθεν. Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, sed ingentum profitemur, ipse enim à nullo originem ducit, ex quo & Filius nativitate, & Spiritus Sanctus processionem accepit. Fons ergo ipse & origo est totius divinitatis. Concil. Toletan. 11. Quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est, & manere in æternum, & sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivus de fonte traduxit, Laſtant. de falsa Sap. 1. 4. c. 8. & rursus c. 29. Cum igitur & Pater Filium faciat, & Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est: Sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam Sol, hic tanquam radius à Sole porrectus. § Caput, quod est principium omnium, Filius; caput autem, quod est principium Christi, Deus. Concil. Sirm. accepted and expounded as Orthodox by S. Hilary. Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus. S. Hilary. de Syn. Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater. Ruff. in Synb. Tu capitis caput, & primi tu fontis origo. Hilary. ad Leonem. εἰς δύο εἰσὶν ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τοῦ ὕδατος ὁ πατήρ, μία ἡ ἀρχὴ. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. 11. Caput Filii Pater est, & caput Spiritus Sancti Filius, quia de ipso accepit. S. Aug. Quest. Vet. Test. 9. S. Chrysostome is so clearly of the opinion that the 1 Cor. 11. is to be understood of Christ as God, that from thence he proves him to have the same essence with God. εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ ζωοποιός ὁ ἀπὸρ, ὁμοί-
σις ὃ ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος κεφαλὴ ὃ τὸ ὕψος ὁ θεός, ὁμοίσις ὁ ἰσὺς τοῦ πατρὸς. So likewise Theodoret upon the same place; ἢ ὃ ζωὴ ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδὲ ὁ ὕψος ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ. So S. Cyril. κεφαλὴ τοῦ χειρὸς ὁ θεός ἐπὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν * γεννητὴς γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς. Ad Regim. Ep. 1. * Laſtant. 1. 1. c. 8. S. Hilary. 1. 2. Zach. Myrtilen. † Laſtant. ib. Synes. Hymn. § S. Hieron. in cap. 3. ad Eph. * ἀναρχὸς οὐδ' ὁ πατήρ, ὃ γὰρ ἰσχυρὸν αὐ-
τῷ, ἰδὲ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι. S. Greg. Naz. ὁ ἀρχὸντος ὁ γεννητὴς ἐξ ὅς ἑαυτοῦ, ἐξ ὅς ἑαυτοῦ. S. Athan. Si rursus quod à semetipso sit accipias, nemo tibi ipse & munerator, & munus est. S. Hilary de Trin. 1. 2. Qui putant Deum ejus potentia esse ut seipsum ipse genuerit, eo plus errant, quod non solum Deus ita non est, sed neque corporalis neque spiritualis creatura. Nulla enim omnino res est quæ seipsam gignat ut sit. Et ideo non est credendum, vel dicendum quod Deus genuit se. S. Aug.

and

and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both from the Father who is one, and so the union of them.

Secondly, it is necessary thus to believe in the *Father*, because our salvation is propounded to us by an access unto the Father. We are all gone away and fall'n from God, and we must be brought to him again. There is no other notion under which we can be brought to God as to be saved, but the notion of the Father, and there is no other Person can bring us to the Father, but the Son of that Father: For, as the Apostle teacheth us, *a through him we have an access by one spirit unto the Father.*

Having thus described the true nature and notion of the divine Paternity, in all the several degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his Confession in these words, *I believe in God the Father*: by which I conceive him to expresse thus much.

As I am assured that there is an Infinite and Independent Being, which we call a God, and that it is impossible there should be more Infinities then one: so I assure my self that this one God is the *Father* of all things, especially of all men and Angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be filed generation; that he is further yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the *Father* of all those whom he regenerateth by his Spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and coheirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But beyond and farre above all this, beside his general off-spring, and peculiar people, *to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God*; I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his onely begotten Son; whom he hath not onely begotten of the blessed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power; not onely sent with special authority as the King of Israel; not onely raised from the dead, and made heir of all things in his house; but antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternal generation in the same divinity and majesty with himself: by which paternity, coeval to the deity, I acknowledge him alwayes Father, as much as alwayes God. And in this relation, I professe that eminency and priority, that as he is the Original cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

¶ φύσις δὲ τῆς
τρίτης οὐσίας
ἐκείνης διὰ τὴν
τῆς ἐκείνης καὶ
τῆς ἐκείνης
τῆς ἐκείνης.

Greg. Naz.

Orat. 32. Vn-

to which words

those of Theod.

Abucava have

relation: Οὗτος

ἡ ἐκείνης λέ-

γει, ἐπειδὴ ἡ

ἐκείνης, ἡτοι

ἐκείνης καὶ αὐ-

τοῦ ἐκείνης

τῆς ἐκείνης

πατὴρ ἐστίν, οἷον

εἶπεν ὁ Θεολό-

γος. Opusc. 42.

a Eph. 2. 18.

I Believe in God the Father ALMIGHTY.

After the relation of God's Paternity, immediately followeth the glorious Attribute of his † *Omnipotency*: that as those in heaven in their Devotions, so we on earth in our Confessions might acknowledge that a *Holy holy holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*; that in our solemn meetings at the Church of God, with the joynt expression and concurring language of the Congregation, we might some way imitate that *b voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

for the Father, as Origen. 1. 7. adv. Celsum. Ἐξ ἧς αὐτὸν ... ἐκείνης αὐτῆς λέγει τὰς ποικιλίας· εἰς αὐτὸν
Οὗτος Παντοκράτωρ ἐκείνης αὐτῆς λέγει, εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγον ἐκείνης αὐτῆς
σὺν αὐτῷ. And according to this General Confession did Polycarpus begin his Prayer at his Martyrdom. Κύριε ὁ
Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τὸ ἅπαντὶ καὶ διὰ τὸν αἰῶνα πατὴρ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατρὸς. Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. a Revel. 4. 8.
b Revel. 19. 6.

† For the Old-
est & shortest
Creed had al-
ways this At-
tribute expres-
sed in it. In-
somuch that
Παντοκράτωρ
was ordinarily
by the An-
cients taken

This

This notion of *Almighty* in the Creed, must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament: and that cannot be better understood then by the Greek Writers or Interpreters of the Old, especially when the Notion it self belongs unto the Gospel and the Law indifferently. Now the * word which we translate *Almighty*, the most ancient Greek Interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, *the Lord of hosts*, sometime for his name, *Shaddai*, as generally in the book of Job: by the first they seem to signify the Rule and Dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power by which he is able to perform all things.

^a *The heavens and the earth were finished*, saith Moses, *and all the host of them*: and he which begun them, he which finished them, is the Ruler and Commander of them. Upon the right of Creation doth he justly challenge this dominion. ^b *I have made the earth, and created man upon it, I, even my hands have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.* And on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of *† the Lord of hosts*; which though preserved in the * original language both by S. Paul, and S. James, yet by S. John is turned into that word which we translate *Almighty*. Wherefore from the use of the sacred Writers, from the † notation of the word in Greek, and from the testimony of the ancient ‖ Fathers, we may well ascribe unto God the Father in the explication of this Article, the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the * sacred Scriptures; from whence those † names or titles which most aptly and fully expresse dominion, are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that natural and eternal right of dominion.

* παντοκράτωρ, translated by Terent. and S. Aug. Omnipotens, (as Terentilian translates, κοσμοκράτορες mundi tenentes) by Prudentius, Omnipotens, by all Omnipotens. (as S. Hilary translated κοσμοκράτορας mundipotentis) and, as I conceive, it is translated Capax universorum, by the Latine Interpreter of Hermas, Primum omnium crede quod unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit, & consummavit, & ex nihilo fecit. Ipse capax universorum,

folus immensus est. 1. 2. Mand. 1. Which by the Interpreter of Irenaeus is thus translated. Omnium capax & qui à nemine capiatur. 1. 4. c. 37. a Gen. 2. 1. b Isa. 45. 12. † Κύριος Σαβαωθ. * εἰ μὴ κύριος Σαβαωθ ἐγχετίληται ἡμῖν σωτηρία. Rom. 9. 29. the words of Isa. 1. 9. καὶ αἱ σοαὶ τῶν θεοκρατῶν ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος κύριος Σαβαωθ εἰσαληύσονται. Jam. 5. 4. which are the words of S. James, in relation to Deut. 24. 15. ἀγαπᾷ, ἀγαπᾷ, ἀγαπᾷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Revel. 4. 8. which were before in Isaiah, ἀγαπᾷ, ἀγαπᾷ, ἀγαπᾷ κύριος Σαβαωθ. Isa. 6. 3. Τὸ δ' ὅμοιον ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Σαβαωθ φωνῆς. πολλὰ καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν παραλαμβάνουσιν, ἐπὶ εἰς μὴ λαμβάνουσιν τὸ ὄνομα εἰς τὸ κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, ὁ κύριος τῶν ἐξουσιῶν, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ (διαφέρει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐξουσιῶν οἱ ἱερῶν ὄντες αὐτοῦ) ἰδὲν ποιοῦμεν. Orig. contra. Cels. 1. 5. † that παντοκράτωρ should have the signification of government in it, according to the composition in the Greek Language, no man can doubt, who has only considers those vulgar terms of their Politicks, δυναστεία, ἐξουσία, from whence it appears that μοναρχία might as well have been used as μοναρχία: and in that sense αὐτοκράτωρ is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman Emperour, not only the later Historians, but even the Coins of Julius Caesar. Hefsy. Αὐτοκράτωρ, αὐτοκράτωρ, κοσμοκράτωρ, because the Roman Emperour was ruler of the known world. So the Devils or Princes of the air are termed by S. Paul κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. 6. 12. which is all one with ἐξουσία τῷ κόσμῳ, as will appear, Job. 12. 31. 14. 30. 16. 11. As therefore Κεῖται signifies of it self rule and authority, Hefsy. Κεῖται, βασιλεία, ἐξουσία Κεῖται, ἀρχή, ἐξουσία to which sense Eustathius hath observed Homer led the following writers by those words of Ἡρ., ... ὅν δὲ κεῖται αἰὲν αἰὲν, Iliad M. τὸ μὴ κεῖται Συλλαμδανία π τοῖς ὑπερῶν τῶν βασιλείων κεῖται λόγος, whence Eschylus calls Agamemnon and Menelaus διδρυον κεῖται Ἀχαιοί, and Sophocles after him, δινεαίς Ἀργείδας and as κεῖται to rule or govern, (Κεῖται, κυβερνᾷ, ἀρχεῖ) from whence Κεῖται, ἀρχεῖ, ἐξουσία: So also in composition, παντοκράτωρ, the ruler of all. Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ θεός, πάντων κρατῶν. Hefsy. Παντοκρατορία, παντοχρᾶ. Suid. ἡ αἰσαντι ἐν ὀδῳ ἐν παντοκράτωρ ὁ θεός παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων κρατῶν, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων. οἱ δὲ λήγοντες τὸν μὴ εἶναι τῆς ὑπερῶν διασώτη, ὅ δὲ τὸ Καμῶν, ὅ δὲ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἔχων, Καμῶν δὲ ἐξουσία μὴ ἔχων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; καὶ ὁ διασώτης Συμῶν, μὴ ἐξουσιάζων δὲ πᾶσι μὴ τῶν παντοκράτωρ; S. Cyril. Catech. 8. Unus est Dominus Jesus Christus per quem Deus Pater dominatur omnium tenet; unde & sequens sermo Omnipotentem pronuntiat Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium teneat potentatum. Ruffin. in Symb. * ἐξουσία. Luke 12. 5. Ἄψ 1. 7. Jud. 25. Revel. 5. 13. † as κύριος, κύριος, διασώτης. ὁ μὴ τὸ κύριος καὶ πρῶτος ἐν, ὅ δὲ τῆς ἐξουσίας πάντα, καὶ ὅς πάντων διασώτης, τὰ γὰρ Σύμπτωτα δὲ ἐν τῇ. Phot. Ep. 162.

What

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or branches of it: the first whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedom of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the Lord and master of them, by vertue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using, and disposing all things so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention onely for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. Gods actual dominion being no otherwayes necessary, then upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this Almighty, is further to be considered in the Independency and Infinity of it. First, it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the original, and the use thereof. For God hath received no authority from any, because he hath all power originally in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it; as being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the ^a God of Gods, is also the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, the onely potentate; because he alone hath all power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

The Infinity of Gods Dominion, if we respect the Object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the Manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the Time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the object is sufficiently evidenced by those appellations, which the holy writ ascribeth unto the Almighty, calling him the ^b Lord of heaven, the Lord of the whole earth, the Lord of heaven and earth; under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moses taught the distrustful Israelites in the wilderness. Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lords thy God, the earth also with all that is therein. With these words David glorifieth God: The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine; so acknowledging his dominion: as for the world and the fullness thereof, thou hast founded them; so expressing the foundation, or ground of that dominion. And yet more fully, at the dedication of the offerings for the building of the Temple, to shew that what they gave was of his own, he saith, ^c Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdome, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all. If then we look upon the object of Gods Dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things; so that nothing can be imagined, which is not his, belonging to him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to his will, as the sole governour and disposer: in respect

^a Deut. 10. 17.

Psal. 136. 3.

1 Tim. 6. 15.

μονος δυνάστες.

Sap. Syr. 46. 6.

ἐξουσις δυνάστες

2 Mac. 15. 29.

ὁ δυνάστης τῶν

ἐξουσιῶν. 3. 24.

ὁ τῶν πατέρων

κύριος, καὶ πα-

τερς ἐξουσίας

δυνάστες.

Ἰσαΐας 45. 1.

ὁ κύριος.

^b Dan. 5. 23.

Iosh. 3. 11, 13.

Psal. 97. 5.

Mic. 4. 13.

Zac. 4. 14, 5.

Matth. 11. 25.

Acts 17. 24.

Deut. 10. 14.

Psal. 89. 11.

^c 1 Chro. 29.

11, 12.

כבודך בכל

כימך בכל

πάντα γὰρ πα-

τα τοῖς θεοῖς

ὑποτά, καὶ

πάντα πάντα

ταῦτα εἰς θεόν

ἐκτετα. Xe-

noph. de ex-

ped. Cypri. 1. 2.

respect of which universal power we must confesse him to be *Almighty*.

* If we consider the manner and nature of this Power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear: for as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intension, he hath all power over every thing, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he catechized the prophet Jeremy in a potters house, saying, ^a *O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter, saith the Lord? behold, as the clay is in the potters hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel.* That is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdom on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposal of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his free, but wise, and just decrees. ^b *Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?* And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother pottheard, (both being made of the same metal) then God hath over him, who by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that?

The duration of Gods dominion must likewise necessarily be eternal, if any thing which is be immortal. For, being every thing is therefore his, because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production, it followeth that so long as it is continued, it must be his, and consequently being some of his creatures are immortal, his dominion must be eternal. Wherefore S. Paul expressly calleth God *the King eternal*, with reference to that of David, ^d *Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* And Moses in his Song hath told us, ^e *the Lord shall reign for ever and ever*: which phrase *for ever and ever* in the original signifieth thus much, that there is no time to come assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

The third branch of Gods authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by virtue of his absolute dominion. For it is the general dictate of reason, that the use, benefit and utility of any thing redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the proprietor it belongeth. 'Tis true indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his original felicity, cannot receive any real benefit and utility from the creature. ^f *Thou art my Lord, saith David, my goodnesse extendeth not to thee.* And therefore our onely and absolute Lord, because his goodnesse extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for

^a I Tim. i. 15.

τὸ βασίλειόν σου αἰώνιον.

^d Psal. 145. 13

כל עולם
כל עולם

LXX βασίλειά σου αἰώνιον.

^e Exod. 15. 18.

לעולם ועד

LXX ἰσχύς σου αἰώνια

καὶ ἰσχύς σου.

S. Hier. in scaculum & ultra. So Aquila, Theod. and the Fifth Edit.

in Psal. 21. 5.

So the LXX again,

Dan. 12. 7.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες καὶ ἰσχύς σου.

and Mich. 4. 5. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες καὶ ἰσχύς σου.

^f Psal. 16. 2. Ille nostra servitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus, ut operetur & custodiat nos: & ideo verus & solus est Dominus, quia non illi ad suam, sed ad nostram utilitatem salutemque servimus. Nam si nobis indigeret, eo ipso non verus dominus esset, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur necessitas, sub qua & ipse serviret. S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. 1.8. c. 11. Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu, quare? quoniam bonorum non eges. Ille non eget nostri, nos egemus ipsius; ideo verus dominus. Nam tu non valde verus dominus servi tui; ambo homines, ambo egentes Deo. Si verò putas egere tui servum tuum, ut des panem, eges & tu servi tui, ut adjuvet labores tuos. Uterque vestrum altero vestrum indiget: itaque nullus vestrum vere dominus, & nullus vestrum vere servus. Audi verum Dominum, cujus verus es servus. Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu, quare tui dominus? quoniam bonorum meorum non eges. Id. ad Psal. 69.

* So Ra. Solomon will have it compounded of the pronoun, and שׁוֹרֵר בְּאֵלֹהֵינוּ לְכָל בְּרִיָּה

because in God there is sufficiency, that is, sufficient power over every creature: from whence the LXX Ruth 1. 20, 21. Job 21. 15.

31. 2. 39. 32. translate it ισχυρις, as Sym. Job 22. 3.

and Aquila with him, Ezek. 1. 24.

† שׁוֹרֵר vultavit, destruxit, perdidit. from whence שׁוֹרֵר

the destroyer and because utter destruction re-

quires power equivalent to production, the omnipotent; from whence the LXX Job 8. 3.

translate it ὁ παντοκράτωρ. And this Etymology rather

then the former seemeth to be confirmed by the Prophet

Isai. 13. 6. Howl ye for the day of the Lord is at hand,

כִּשְׁרֵי מִשְׁרֵי יוֹם ה' יָבֹא

It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty

(destroyer.) * Homer hath well joyn'd these two. D. 8. ὁ πάντα κρείττων Κεραίων, ὕμνηται κρείττων, * Εὐρυπύλοισι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ὅτι δὴν ἐκ ὀμνέμεν. * Hoc nisi credamus, periclitatur ipsum nostrae fidei Confessionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quia quicquid vult potest, nec voluntate ejusjuspam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus. S. Aug. Enchir. c. 96. † Article 1. πᾶσις ἐστὶν θεὸς πα-

τις παντοκράτωρ. Art. 6. καὶ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς θεὸς πάντοδωμμε. * As Theophilus Bishop of Antioch, giving account of those words which are attributed unto God, as θεός, κύριος, ὁ θεός, tells us he is called παντοκράτωρ, ὅτι αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποτάσσεται. τὰ γὰρ ὅλα ἢ ὅτι ὁ θεός, καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν. Ad Antol. l. 1.

signific

by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name *Shaddai* we apprehend an infinite force and strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in * composition, as signifying the All-sufficient; whosoever is able to suppeditate all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the † Root denoting vastation or destruction; whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of *Almighty* necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of Gods dominion speaketh him infinitely * powerfull in operation. Indeed in earthly dominions, the strength of the Governour is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: and he is a powerfull Prince, whose subjects are numerous. But the King of Kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a nation in the person of the King, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could rebellion be successfull: whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant Prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people hath taken the boldnesse to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the Governour of the world ruleth onely over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yoke with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible. For man is not more inclineable to obey God then man, but God is more powerfull to exact subjection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him *Almighty*; and so according to the most vulgar acception, give the second explication of his || *Omnipotency*.

† But because this word *Almighty* is twice repeated in the Creed, once in this first Article, and again in the sixth, where Christ is represented sitting at the right hand of God the Father *Almighty*; & although in our English and the Latine the same word be expressed in both places, yet in the ancient Greek Copies there is a manifest distinction; being the word in the first Article may equally comprehend Gods power in operation, as well as authority in dominion, whereas that in the sixth speaketh onely infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I shall therefore reserve the explication of the later unto its proper place, designing to treat particularly of Gods infinite power where it is most peculiarly expressed; and so conclude briefly with two other interpretations, which some of the Ancients have made of the Original word, belonging rather to Philosophy then Divinity, though true in both. For * some have stretched this word *Almighty*, according to the Greek notation, to

signific

signifie that God holdeth, incircleth, and containeth all things, ^a *Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? who but God?* ^a Prov. 30. 4.
^b *who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure?* ^b Isa. 40. 12:
 who but he? Thus then may he be called *Almighty*, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things.

* Others extend it further yet, beyond that of containing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of sustaining or preservation. For the same power which first gave being unto all things, continueth the same being unto all. ^c *God giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things. In him we live, move and have our being,* saith the strangest Philosopher that ever entred Athens, the first expositor of that blind inscription, *To the unknown God.* ^d *How could any thing have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved if not called by thee?* as the wisdom of the Jews confesseth. Thus did the Levites stand and bless, ^e *Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all.* Where the continuall conservation of the creature is in an equal latitude attributed unto God with their first production. Because there is as absolute a necessity of preserving us from returning unto nothing by annihilation, as there was for first bestowing an existence on us by creation. And in this sense God is undoubtedly *Almighty*, in that he doth sustain, uphold, and constantly preserve all things in that being which they have.

From whence we may at last declare, what is couched under this attribute of God, how far this Omnipotency extends it self, and what every Christian is thought to profess, when he addeth this part of the first Article of his Creed, *I believe in God the Father*
ALMIGHTIE.

As I am perswaded of an infinite and independent essence which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternal generation by which that God is a Father: So I assure my self that Father is not subject to infirmities of age, nor is there any weaknesse attending on the *Ancient of dayes*; but on the contrary, I believe omnipotency to be an essential attribute of his Deity, and that not onely in respect of operative and active power, (concerning which I shall have occasion to expresse my faith hereafter) but also in regard of power authoritative, in which I must acknowledge his antecedent and eternal right of making what, and when, and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its Independency, both in the Original, and the Use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge Infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternal, without end or conclusion. Thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

* *As Greg.*

Nyssen. *ὁ πᾶν*

ὅταν τις Πάσης

κρίσας πάντα

ἀποκαταστήσει

τὸ πᾶν κατὰ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

πᾶν καὶ τὸ πᾶν

καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ

Maker of heaven and earth.

* For we finde it not mentioned by S. Augustine de Fide & Symbolo; neither hath Ruffinus expounded it in the Aquileian, or noted it to be found in the Roman or Oriental Creeds. Leo reciting the three first Articles in his Epistle to Flavianus, maketh no mention of it. Epist. 10. Maximus Taurinensis hath it not in Traditione Symboli, nor Petrus Chrysologus in his Sermons, amongst six several expositions; It is not in the Homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus, or the Exposition of Venantius Fortunatus. Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra left it not at Rome with Iulius. Nor did Arius in his Catholick Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it. Neither are the words to be found in the Latine or Greek Copy of the Creed written about the beginning of the eighth Century, and published out of the MSS. by the most Reverend and Learned Archbishop of Armach: or in that which Eucherius and Beatus produced against Elipandus Archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh Century. † As in that delivered by Irenæus, εἰς ἵνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ἀεικαίοντα τὸν ἀειζώντα καὶ τὸν ἀειβίοντα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ad. Her. l. 1. c. 2. and that by Tertul. Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit. De præser. adv. Her. c. 13. And that under the name of Novatian, not in formal words, but with an, id est, by way of explication. Regula exigit veritatis ut primò omnium credamus in Deum Patrem & Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omniuna perfectissimum conditorem, qui cœlum alta sublimitate suspendit, terram dejecta mole solidavit, maria soluto liquore diffudit, & hæc omnia propriis & condignis instrumentis & ornata & plena digessit. De Trinit. c. 1. It was also observed by Origen that the Christians were wont most frequently to mention God under that as the most common Title. ἡ γὰρ ἀρχαῖος θεός, ὁ πάντων δημιουργός, ὁ Θεός, ἡ καὶ μετὰ ἀποδόκιμος τῆς, ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς. Adv. Celsum l. 1. Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνὰ θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ὅλος ἀπάντων ἐπαρξάμενον καὶ ἀρχαῖον πάντων: and that Council expressed the same without alteration in their Creed. But after the Nicene Council, we finde added πνεῦμα ἅγιον καὶ ζῶν, by S. Cyril of Ierusalem in his Catechisme, and Epiphanius in Ancorato, which addition was received, confirmed, and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we finde this Article thus expressed in the Western Confessions; Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli & terræ. a Exod. 31. 17.

ALthough this last part of the First Article were not expressed in the * ancient Creeds, yet the sense thereof was delivered in the † first Rules of Faith, and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latine Confessions. And indeed the work of Creation most properly followeth the Attribute of Omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is a God, and that God Almighty; as we acknowledge that same God to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in him of us: so we also confesse that the same God the Father made both heaven and earth. For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first to declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the terms of heaven and earth; secondly, to expresse the nature of the action, the true notion of creation, by which they were made; and thirdly, to demonstrate the Person, to whom this operation is ascribed.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the Creed, that under the terms of heaven and earth are comprehended all things; because the first Rules of Faith did so expresse it, and the most ancient Creeds had either instead of these words, or together with them, the maker of all things visible and invisible, which being terms of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universal comprehension: nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible or invisible. Being then these were the words of the Nicene Creed; being the addition of heaven and earth in the Constantinopolitane could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; it followeth that they which in the Latine Church made use onely of this last addition, could not chuse but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the Creed, because it is the known language of the Sacred Scriptures. a In six

words did Arius in his Catholick Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it. Neither are the words to be found in the Latine or Greek Copy of the Creed written about the beginning of the eighth Century, and published out of the MSS. by the most Reverend and Learned Archbishop of Armach: or in that which Eucherius and Beatus produced against Elipandus Archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh Century. † As in that delivered by Irenæus, εἰς ἵνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ἀεικαίοντα τὸν ἀειζώντα καὶ τὸν ἀειβίοντα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ad. Her. l. 1. c. 2. and that by Tertul. Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit. De præser. adv. Her. c. 13. And that under the name of Novatian, not in formal words, but with an, id est, by way of explication. Regula exigit veritatis ut primò omnium credamus in Deum Patrem & Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omniuna perfectissimum conditorem, qui cœlum alta sublimitate suspendit, terram dejecta mole solidavit, maria soluto liquore diffudit, & hæc omnia propriis & condignis instrumentis & ornata & plena digessit. De Trinit. c. 1. It was also observed by Origen that the Christians were wont most frequently to mention God under that as the most common Title. ἡ γὰρ ἀρχαῖος θεός, ὁ πάντων δημιουργός, ὁ Θεός, ἡ καὶ μετὰ ἀποδόκιμος τῆς, ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς. Adv. Celsum l. 1. Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνὰ θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ὅλος ἀπάντων ἐπαρξάμενον καὶ ἀρχαῖον πάντων: and that Council expressed the same without alteration in their Creed. But after the Nicene Council, we finde added πνεῦμα ἅγιον καὶ ζῶν, by S. Cyril of Ierusalem in his Catechisme, and Epiphanius in Ancorato, which addition was received, confirmed, and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we finde this Article thus expressed in the Western Confessions; Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli & terræ. a Exod. 31. 17.

But

But as the Apostle hath taught us to reason, *When he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him*: So when we say, all things were made by God, it is as manifest that he is excepted who made all things. And then the Proposition is clearly thus delivered; All Beings whatsoever beside God were made. As we read in S. John concerning the ^bWord, *that the world was made by him*; and in more plain and expresse words before, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*. Which is yet further illustrated by S. Paul: *For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him*. If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God.

were made. As we read in S. John concerning the ^b Word, *that the world was made by him; and in more plain and expresse words before, all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Which is yet further illustrated by S. Paul: *For by him were*

made. Which is yet further illustrated by S. Paul: "For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him. If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God."

This then is the unquestionable doctrine of the Christian faith, That the vast capacious frame of the World, and every thing any way contained and existing in it, hath not its essence from, or of it self, nor is of existence absolutely necessary; but what it is, it hath not been, and that being which it hath, was made, framed and constituted by another. And as *every house is builded by some man*; for we see the Earth bear no such creature of it self; stones do not grow into a wall, or first hew, and square, then unite and fasten themselves together in their generation; trees sprout not crosse like dry and saplesse beams, nor do sparres and tiles spring with a naturall uniformity into a roof, and that out of stone and mortar: these are not the works of nature, but superstructions and additions to her, as the supplies of Art, and the testimonies of the understanding of Man, the great Artificer on earth: So if the World it self be but an * house, if the earth *which hangeth upon nothing*, be the foundation, and the glorious spheres of heaven the roof, if this be the habitation of an infinite intelligencie, the † Temple of God; then must we acknowledge the world was built by him, and consequently, that *he which built all things is God.*

From hence appears the truth of that distinction, Whatsoever hath any being is either made or not made: whatsoever is not made, is God; whatsoever is not God, is made. One uncreated and independent essence; all other depending on it, and created by it. One of eternall and necessary existences; all other indifferent, in respect of actually existing, either to be or not to be, and that indifferency determined only by the free and voluntary act of the first cause.

Now because to be thus made includes some imperfection, and among the parts of the world some are more glorious then others; if those which are most perfect presuppose a maker, then can we not doubt of a creation where we find farre lesse perfection. This house of God, though uniforme, yet is not all of the same materialls, the footstool and the throne are not of the same mould; there is a vast difference between the heavenly expansions. This first aeriell heaven, where God setteth up his pavilion, where *he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind*, is not so farre inferiour in place, as it is in glory to the next, the seat of the Sun and Moon, the two great lights, and starres innumerable, farre greater then the one of them. And yet that second heaven is not so farre above the first

This is the first part of our Christian faith, against some of the ancient Philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined † the Universe to be infinite and eternall, and, what will follow from it, to be even God himself. 'Tis true that the most ancient of the Heathen was not of this opinion, but * all the

νία, or Ομογρία, or the like. Εἰσι γὰρ τινες οἱ παλαιὸι ἀπὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶνα φθί πρὸς μέγεθος, καὶ αὐτὰ πάντα γένεσθαι· γινώσκουσι δὲ τὰ μὴ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ διαμένειν, καὶ δεῖ πάντας γενέσθαι· μάλιστα μὲν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος, εἴτα ὁ καλεῖται Διόνυσος ὁ πρώτος ποιητὴς τῶν μυθιστορημάτων, [says Aristotle de Caelo l. 3. c. 1. In which words he manifestly ascribes the doctrine of the creation of the world not only to Hesiod, but to all the first natural Philosophers; which learning beginning with Prometheus the first Professor of that Science, continued in that family amongst the Atlantiads, who all successively delivered that truth. After them the Ionian Philosophy did acknowledge it, and the Italian received it by Pythagoras, whose Scholars all maintained it beside Ocellus Lucanus, the first of them that fancied the world not made; whom Plato though he much esteemed, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident than that he held the world was made. Διότι οὗτοι διὰ δὲ ἡμετέραν γίνονται καὶ τοὺς πάντας οἱ ζωοῦντες ζωοῦσινται, ἀθάβιοι δὲ. In which words he delivers not only the generation of the Universe, but also the true cause thereof, which is the goodness of God. For he which asks this plain and clear question, τίποτε ἐστὶν αὐτὸ γένεσθαι ἀπὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ζῆγοντες ἀπὸ ἀδελφῶν πρὸς ἀδελφοὺς; and answers the question briefly with a γάρων: He which gives this general rule upon it, καὶ δὲ αὐτὸ ζῆγοντες φαμὲν οὕτως· αὐτὸς πρὸς ἀνάγκην εἶνα γένεσθαι, and then immediately concludes, τὸν μὲν οὐκ ἐποίησαν καὶ πρὸς τὸν πάντας οὐκ ἐποίησαν, καὶ διότι οὗτοι εἰς πάντας ἀδελφῶν γένοντες· cannot; (notwithstanding all the [bits of his Greek expostors,) be imagined to have conceived the World not made. And Aristotle, who best understood him, tells us clearly his Opinion ἐκ τῶ Τίμιου, from whence I cited the precedent words, καὶ γὰρ φασὶν τὸν οὐρανὸν (where by the way observe that in Plato's Timæus οὐρανός and κόσμος are made Synonymous) γένεσθαι μὲν, οὐ μὲν φασκεῖν.

Philo

τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ κόσμου, *the beginning of the world*, *Jaies*
Aristotle de
 Cælo. l. i. c. 10.
 confessing it
 is the general o-
 pinion, that
 the world was
 made. Which
 was so ancient
 a Tradition of
 all the first
 Philosophers,
 that from Lin-
 nus, Mævus,
 Orpheus, Ho-
 mer, Hesiod &
 the rest, they
 all mentioned
 the Original of
 the world, en-
 titling their
 books, Κοσμογονί-
 ας, τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ
 κόσμου, *the beginning of the crea-
 tion*, who all Ju-
 dalian received
 that fancied the
 more evident then
 Moses, ἀπαλοῦς Ἰω-
 σὴφ, *who is the
 first*, *Jaies*, *the*
 gives this ge-
 nerally concludes,
 cannot, (nor
 made. And
 cited the prece-
 and νόμος are
 Philo

the world did ever grow up from lesse to greater, or improve it self from worse to better: nor can we now perceive that it becomes worse or lesse then it was, by which decretion we might guesse at a former encrease, and from a tendency to corruption collect its original generation. This conceit, I say, is far more grosse. For certainly the Argument so managed proves nothing at all, but onely this, (if yet it prove so much) that the whole frame of the world, and the parts thereof which are of greater perfection, were not generated in that manner in which we see some other parts of it are: which no man denies. But that there can be no other way of production beside these petty generations, or that the World was not some other way actually produced, this Argument doth not endeavour to inferre, nor can any other prove it.

The next Foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their Predecessours, was that general Assertion, That it is impossible for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing: from whence it will inevitably follow, that the matter of this world hath alwayes been, and must alwayes be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made: the second part before propounded for the exposition of this Article.

Now that the true nature and manner of this Action may be so far understood as to declare the Christian Faith, and refute the errors of all opposers, it will be necessary to consider it first with reference to the Object or Effect, secondly, in relation to the Cause or Agent, thirdly, with respect unto the Time or Origination of it.

The Action by which the heaven and earth were made, considered in reference to the effect, I conceive to be the production of their totall beings; so that whatsoever entity they had when made, had no real existence before they were so made, and this manner of production we usually term Creation, as excluding all concurrence of any material cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as presupposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing, * that is, by which something is made, and not any thing out of which 'tis made. This is the proper and peculiar sense of the word Creation: not that it signifies so much by virtue of its origination or vulgar use in the † Latine tongue, nor that the Hebrew word used by Moses, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*, hath of it self any such peculiar acception. For it is often used † synonymously with words which signifie any kind of

† ἀμύχανον γὰρ τὸ ὅτι ἀποτέλειται ἐκ οὐδενός, ἢ ἐκ τῶν οὐκ ὄντων, ἢ ἐκ τῶν μὴ ὄντων ἀναλυθέντων. ἀφ' οὗτων δὲ ἀναλύεται τὸ πᾶν. Ocellus.

* So I conceive it best expressed by Anselme Archbishop of Canterbury. Dicitur aliquid esse factum de nihilo, cum intelligimus esse quidem factum, sed non esse aliquid unde sit factum. Monologii. c. 8.

† Creatio apud nos generatio vel nativitas dicitur, apud Græcos vero sub nomine creationis verbum facturæ & conditionis accipitur. S. Hieron. ad Eph. 4. ברא is promiscuously used with עשה, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effectum, and with יצר, which rather implies a for-

mation out of something, from whence יצר a potter. For the first, we read Genes. 2. 3. that God rested from all his work, אשר ברא אלהים לעשות, not that on the sixth day he did the work of two dayes, that he might rest on the seventh, as Rabbi Solomon; nor that in six dayes he made the roots of things, that they might afterward produce the like, as Aben Ezra; nor these or any other fancies of the Rabbines; as if ברא signified one work and עשה another, for they both express the production, as appears clearly in the following verse, These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, בראם when they were created, עשה ביום in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth. So Isa. 45. 12. I have made the earth, and created man upon it: where the first expresseth the proper, the second the improper creation, which indifferent acception appeareth in collating Psal. 115. 16. 121. 2. with Isa. 42. 5. 45. 18. as also Isa. 17. 7. with Eccl. 12. 1. From whence the Septuagint translate ברא indifferently ποιεῖν or ἀλλεῖν. For the second, יצר is usually rendred by the Targum ברא, and by the LXX, though generally πλάττειν, yet sometimes ἀλλεῖν; and that it hath the same signification will appear by conferring Gen. 2. 7. with Isa. 45. 12. and not onely so, but by that single verse Isa. 43. 1. Now thus saith the Lord ברא that created thee, O Jacob, יצר, and he that formed thee, O Israel. Lastly, all these are jointly used in the same validity of expression, Isa. 43. 7. Every one that is called by my name, for בראתי I have created him for my glory, יצרתי I have formed him, yea עשיתי I have made him.

^a As Gen. 1.

21.

^b Gen. 1. 27.

2. 7.

^c Psal. 51. 12.

^d Isa. 65. 17.

^e Num. 16. 30.

^f Isa. 45. 7.

Creatio at-

que conditio

nunquam nisi

in magnis o-

peribus no-

minantur :

verbi causa,

mundus crea-

tus est, urbs

condita est,

domus vero

quamvis ma-

gna sit, ædi-

ficata potius

dicitur, quam

condita vel

creata. In

magnis enim

operibus at-

que facturis

verbum crea-

tionis assu-

mitur. S. Hier.

ad Eph. c. 4.

^e 2 Macc. 7. 28.

^f 1 Iohn 3. 1.

^g Jer. 32. 23.

(מקרא)

^h Heb. 11. 3.

† For I take

מחזיק בזה

in this

place to be e-

quivalent un-

to מן הבריות

in the Macca-

bees, and that

of the same

sense with מן

הבריות, as the

Syriac Tran-

slation. מן

הבריות

ex iis quæ non

coſpiciuntur.

Which manner of

speech may be

observed even

in the best

Greek Authors,

as in Aristotle,

μεταβαλλειν δὲ τὸ μεταβαλλειν

τὸ εὐχεσθαι ἢ γὰρ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ εἰς ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν

production, or formation, and by it self it seldome denotes a produ-
ction out of nothing, or proper creation, but most frequently, the
making of one substance out of another preexisting, as the ^a fishes of
the water, and ^b man of the dust of the earth; the ^c renovating or re-
storing any thing to its former perfection, for want of Hebrew words
in composition; or lastly, the doing some new or wonderful work,
the producing some strange and admirable effect, as the ^d opening
the mouth of the earth, and the signal ^e judgements on the people
of Israel.

We must not therefore weakly collect the true nature of Creation
from the force of any word which by some may be thought to ex-
presse so much, but we must collect it from the testimony of God the
Creatour in his word, and of the world created in our reason. The
opinion of the Church of the Jews will sufficiently appear in that ze-
alous mother to her seventh and youngest son; ^e *I beseech thee, my son,*
look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider
that God made them of things that were not, which is a clear description
of Creation, that is, production out of nothing. But because this is
not by all received as Canonical, we shall therefore evince it by the
undoubted testimony of S. Paul, who expressing the nature of Abra-
ham's faith, propoundeth *him whom he believed as God who quickeneth*
the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were. For as
to be called in the Language of the Scriptures is to be, (^f *Behold what*
manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called
the sons of God, saith S. John in his Epistle, who in his Gospel told
us, *he had given us power to become the sons of God:*) so to call is to make
or cause to be. As where the Prophet Jeremy saith, *g thou hast caused*
all this evil to come upon them, the original may be thought to speak
no more then this, *thou hast called this evil to them.* He therefore
calleth those things which be not, as if they were, who maketh those things
which were not, to be, and produceth that which hath a being out of
that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This reason generally
persuasive unto faith, is more peculiarly applied by the Apostle to the
belief of the Creation: for ^h *through faith,* saith he, *we understand that*
the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen
were not made of things which do appear. Not as if the earth, which
we see, were made of air, or any more subtile body, which we see
not; nor as if those things which are seen, were in equal latitude com-
mensurable with the worlds which were framed: but that those
things which are seen, that is, which are, were made of those which [†] did
not appear, that is, which were not.

Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter coeval with God,
as necessary for production of the world, by way of subject, as the
eternal and Almighty God by way of efficient. For if some real and
material being must be presupposed by indispensable necessity, with-
out which God could not cause any thing to be, then is not he inde-
pendent in his actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity;
which is contradictory to the divine perfection. Nor can any reason
be alledged, why he should be dependent in his operation, who is
confessed independent in his being.

ex iis quæ non coſpiciuntur. Which manner of speech may be observed even in the best Greek Authors,
as in Aristotle, μεταβαλλειν δὲ τὸ μεταβαλλειν τὸ εὐχεσθαι ἢ γὰρ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ εἰς ἵνα μεταβαλλειν εἰς
μεταβαλλειν, ἢ μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν εἰς μεταβαλλειν, ἢ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν εἰς μὴ μεταβαλλειν. Where εἰς ἵνα μεταβαλλειν
is the same with ἵνα μεταβαλλειν, and μὴ ἵνα μεταβαλλειν with εἰς μὴ μεταβαλλειν.

And

*Nemo enim non eget eo de cuius utitur; nemo non subjicitur ei cuius eget ut possit uti. Sic & nemo de alieno utendo, non minor est eo de cuius utitur; & nemo qui prestat de suo uti, non in hoc superior est eo cui prestat uti.
Tertul. adv.

Tertul. adv.
Hermog. c. 8.

Hermog. c. 8.
† Grande re-
vera benefici-
um contulit,
ut haberet
hodie per
quem Deus
cognosceretur
& omni-
potens voca-
retur: nisi
quod jam
non omnipo-
tens, si non
& hoc po-
tens, ex nihi-
lo omnia pro-
ferre. *Ibidem.*
Quomodo
ab homine
divina illa
vis differet,
fi, ut homo,
sic etiam

ria ministratur.

H 2

crea-

creature to inferre the same imbecillity in the Creatour, and to measure the arm of God by the finger of man? Whatsoever speaketh any kind of excellency or perfection in the artificer, may be attributed unto God: whatsoever signifieth any infirmity or involveth any imperfection, must be excluded from the notion of him. That wisdom, prescience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an Artift, is most eminently contained in him, who hath^a ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight; but if the most absolute Idea in the Artificers understanding be not sufficient to produce his designe, without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto preexisting matter, then that he is really compounded of corporeal parts.

a. *wis. II. 10.*

Again, 'tis as incongruous to judge of the production of the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption, and thence to conclude that if it ever had a cause of the being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are, and if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all. For nothing is more certain then that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see the Plants grow from a seed; that is their ordinary way of generation: but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the preexisting plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the original of their being: but this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egge are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed because the seed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within it self a power of germination; because the spawn and egge are sejungeable from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolifick power of generation; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminal bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all those creatures should arise. But in viviparous Animals, whose offspring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminal or prolifick power, this is not onely improbable, but inconceivable. And therefore being the * Philosophers themselves confesse, that whereas now all animals are generated by the means of seed, and that the animals themselves must be at first before the seed proceeding from them; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to, and differing from the common way of generation, and consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Being then that uni-

* These words of Aristotle are very observable, in which he disputes against Speusippus and the Pythagoreans, who thought the rudiments

of things first made, out of which they grew unto perfection. "Οσοι ἡ ἀρχὴ ἀμείνων, ὡς αὐτοὶ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπασίππῳ, τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἀκαίριστον μὴ εἶναι ἀρχὴ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ εἶναι τὴν ζῶαν τὰς ἀρχαίας αἰτιάς μὴ εἶναι, τὸ ἡ καλὸν ἐπὶ τὸ τίμιον ἐν τοῖς ἐν ταῖς αἰτίαις, ἐκ ὁμοῦ οὐκ εἶναι. τὸ γὰρ σπέρμα ἐξ ὕδατος ἐστὶ πρῶτον τι εἶναι καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἢ σπέρμα εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τὸ τίμιον οὐκ ἐστὶ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπου περὶ εἶναι τὸ σπέρμα, ἢ τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἐξ ἧς τὸ σπέρμα. By which words Aristotle hath sufficiently destroyed his own Argument, which we produced before out of the first of the Physicks, and is excellently urged in that Philosophicall piece attributed unto Iust. Martyr: Εἰ πρῶτον ἐστὶ τὸ σπέρμα σπέρμα, καὶ ὕστερον τὸ ἐν σπέρματι ζῷον ἔσται, καὶ ζῷον ἀμείνων, τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν αὐτῷ καίμην ἐν σπέρματι γιγνόμενον ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ σπέρμα. καὶ ἡ ζῷον αὐτῷ σπέρματι ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ σπέρμα ἢ διωκόμενον. ἐκ ἀρχῆς αὐτὸ τὸ ζῷον καὶ τὸ ζῷον ἐν σπέρματι. Aristot. Dogm. Eversf.

versal

verſal maxime, that *nothing can be made of nothing*, is merely calculated for the meridian of natural cauſes, raiſed ſolely out of obſervation of continuing creatures by ſucceſſive generation, which could not have been ſo continued without a Being antecedent to all ſuch ſucceſſion, it is moſt evident, it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or firſt being, which we call Creation.

Now when we thus deſcribe the nature of Creation, and under the name of *Heaven and Earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we muſt diſtinguiſh between things created. For ſome were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, ſome onely mediately, as out of ſomething formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of Creation. By the firſt were made all immaterial ſubſtances, all the orders of Angels, and the ſouls of men, the heavens and the ſimple or elemental bodies, as the earth, the water, and the aire. ^{b Gen. 1. 1.} *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; ſo in the beginning, as without any preexiſting or antecedent matter: this earth, when ſo in the beginning made, was without forme and void, covered with waters likewiſe made not out of it, but with it, the ſame which, when the waters were gathered together unto one place, appeared as dry land: By the ſecond, all the hoſts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fiſhes of the ſea. Let the earth, ſaid God, bring forth graſſe, the herb yielding ſeed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may ſtie above the earth; and more expreſſly yet; Out of the ground God formed every beaſt of the field, and every fowl of the air. And well may we grant theſe plants and animals to have their origination from ſuch principles, when we read, God formed man of the duſt of the ground; and ſaid unto him whom he created in his own image, Duſt thou art.* ^{IL 20. Gen. 2. 7. 3. 19.}

Having thus declared the notion of Creation in reſpect of thoſe things which were created, the next conſideration is of that Action in reference to the Agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon firſt as moved, ſecondly as free under that motion, thirdly, as determining under that freedome, and ſo performing of that action; In the firſt we may ſee his goodneſſe, in the ſecond his will, in the third his power.

I do not here introduce any external impuſſive cauſe, as moving God unto the Creation of the world; for I have preſuppoſed all things diſtinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and conſequently to be poſterior not onely to the motion but the actuation of his will. Being then nothing can be antecedent to the creature beſide God himſelf, neither can any thing be a cauſe of any of his actions but what is in him; we muſt not look for any thing extrinſecal unto him, but wholly acquieſce in his infinite goodneſſe, as the onely moving and impelling cauſe. ^{a Mat. 19. 17.} *There is none good but one, that is God, ſaith our Saviour; none originally, eſſentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatſoever goodneſſe is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whoſe very being is diffuſive, whoſe nature conſiſts in the communication of it ſelf. In the end of the fixth day ^b God ſaw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good: which ſhews the end of creation of all things thus good, was the communication of that by which they were, and appeared, ſo.* ^{Idem. b Gen. 1. 31.}

The

prerogative of the first Cause. ^b *He worketh all things after the counsell of his own will*, saith the Apostle; and wheresoever counsell is, there is election, or else 'tis vain; where a will, there must be freedome, or else 'tis weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce any thing but what he determineth to produce; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If then his determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the actions which follow them be also free. Being then the goodnesse of God is absolutely perfect of it self, being he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happines as little capable of augmentation as of diminution; he cannot be thought to look upon any thing without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If then we consider Gods goodnesse, he was moved; if his All-sufficiency, he was not necessitated: if we look upon his will, he freely determined; if on his power, by that determination he created the World.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God's goodnesse in the eternal creation of the world will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocal notion of Goodnesse. For if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all vertue and holinesse, with a negation of all things morally evil, vitious, or unholy; so God is absolutely and necessarily good: but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did which made this Argument, that is, rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others; then God is not necessarily, but freely good, that is to say, profitable and beneficial. For he had not been in the least degree evil or unjust, if he had never made the world or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing any thing beside himself: every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow what ere he gives. Much more must that one eternal & independent being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation. We must then look no further then the determination of Gods will in the creation of the World.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to perform. So the Elders speak before him that sitteth upon the Throne; ^c *Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure* (that is, by thy will) *they are and were created*. Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumental advantage in the agent, there the actual determination of the will is a sufficient production. Thus God did make the heavens and the earth by *willing them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. † *Let there be light*, this is the injunction; and *there was light*, that's the creation. Which two are so intimately and immediately the same, that though in our and other translations those words *let there be*, which expresse the command of God, differ from the other, *there was*, which denote the present existence

^b Eph. i. ii.

^c Revel. 4. ii.

* So Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of God. *ὅτι τὸ μόνον ἰδέσθαι αὐτὸ τὸ γινώσκαι. Protrept.*
† *ἡμεῖς τὸ φῶς, καὶ τὸ φῶς ἡμεῖς.*

μα ἔργον ἔν. S. Basil. ὅταν ᾖσαντι θεῷ, καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ πνεῦμα λόγον, τὸν ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς καὶ πνεῦμα. Id. in Hexaem. Τὸς ὑπερβίαις θεοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἡμεῖς καὶ πνεῦμα, ὅμοιόν τῳ θεῷ. Cuvusitamins τῆς κτίσεως. Id. l. 2. adv. Eunomium. ἡ αὖς ἡμεῖς τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ φῶς. Fiat lux, & facta est lux. or as Aquila, ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς. as Symmachus, ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς. all with a difference: whereas in the Hebrew it is a most expressive and significant tautology, אור ואור.

of

ith
ted
tly
nat-
ght
in
God
ble
the
y of
that
de-
ons
do
the
their
con-
y all
r to
sure
ll he
man
ued
y be
arily
ther
out
ppi-
llary
eces-
bted
i Cuv-
puir.
in any
as the
lar τῷ
περὶ τῷ
λα τῷ
παντί
Proclus
und no
y seem
lexan-
m hath
o more
good-
Expo-
scholar
Scho.
ent, is
by κῶ-
ambli-
y cal-
to and
is most
firmed
pre-

seth, and that out of the Principles of Epicurus.

'Tis true indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would persuade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the world, far beyond the Annals of Moses, and account of the same spirit which made it. The† Egyptian Priests pretended an exact Chronology for some myriads of years, and the Chaldeans or † Assyrians far out-reckon

† Plato tells us of an account which an Egyptian Priest gave to Solon, in which the Athenians were 9000 years old, and those of Sais 8000. *ἑσθίοντες μὲν τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν ἱστορίας ἑκατότα ἐκ γῆς τῆς καὶ Ἡρακλίου τοῦ σπάρτατος ποσειδάωνος ἡμῶν. τῶν δὲ ἱστορίας τῶνδε ἐξ ἑκάστη διακοσμήσαντες παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἡμεῖς γεγμέναι σὺν ὀκταμυ-
χαλίῳ ἔτη ἀεὶ μὲν ὄντος γένεσθαι.* In Timæo. Pomponius Mela makes a larger account out of Herodotus. *Ipse vetustissimi (ut præcedit) hominum trecentos & triginta reges ante Amasim, & supra tredecim millium annorum ætates certis Annalibus; where a: the Egyptians much stretch the truth, so doth Mela stretch the relation of Herodotus, who makes it not 13000, but 11340 years. Diodorus Siculus tells us of 23000 years from the reign of the first King of Egypt to the expedition of Alexander, and Diogenes Laertius out of other Authors more then doubles that account. Αἰζώπῳ μὲν γὰρ Νεῖδον χυλίδας παῖδιν Ἡρακλίου ἐν ἀέθρῳ φιλοσοφίας, ὃς τὴν ποσειδῶντος ἱερὰς εὐνοχὰς ποσειδῶντος· ὅταν ᾗ τῆτις εἰς Ἀλγείον ἐν ἡ Μακεδονίᾳ ἐπὶ εὐνοχῇ μελετᾶς πένταρας καὶ ὀκταμυριάδας ὀκτακώσια ἐπὶ ἑξήκοντα τρία. 48863. ἢ Ἀστυόλῳ, δὲ φωνῇ Γάμμελχῳ, οὗ ἑτέῳ ἐξ ἑκαστοῦ μελετᾶς ὅτλη μύνας τῆντων, οὗ φωνῇ Ἰπταρχῳ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑλᾶς ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ ἀποδείξεις ἡμῶν ἡλικίας καὶ αἰσθημάτων μνήμα παρίστανται. Proclus in Timæum.*

them:

them, in which they delivered not onely a Catalogue of their Kings, but also a table of the * Eclipses of the Sun and Moon.

But for their number of years nothing is more certain then their forgery; for the Egyptians did preserve the antiquities of other Nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When Alexander entred Egypt with his victorious army, the Priests could shew him out of their sacred Histories an account of the Persian Empire, which he gained by conquest, and the Macedonian, which he received by birth, of each for 8000 years, whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best Historical account, then that the Persian Empire, whether begun in Cyrus or in Medus, was not then 300 years old, and the Macedonian, begun in Coranus, not 500. They then which made so large additions to advance the antiquity of other Nations, and were so bold as to present them to those which so easily might refute them (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honourable cheat) may without any breach of charity be suspected to have extended the Account much higher for the honour of their own Country. Beside, their Catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the Egyptians make their first Kings reigns above 1200 years a piece, and the Assyrians theirs above 30000; which forced after-ages to take their years for moneths, and these for dayes.

And for the calculation of Eclipses, as it may be made for many thousand years to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to morrow; because the calculation must be made with this tacite condition, if the bodies of the Earth, and Sun, and Moon do continue in their substance and constant motion so long; So may it also be made for many millions of years past, and all be true, if the world have been so old, which the calculating doth not prove, but

* *οὐδὲν ἄλλος ἐπὶ
ἐκλείψας ἡλίου
καὶ τετακτοῦς
ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' ὅτι
ἐκλείψας ἡλίου
καὶ τετακτοῦς
ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' ὅτι
ἐκλείψας ἡλίου
καὶ τετακτοῦς
ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' ὅτι*
Diog. Laert.

*This fallacy
appeareth by
an Epistle
which Alexan-
der wrote to
his mother O-
lympias, men-
tioned by A-
thenagoras,
Minutius Fe-
lix, S. Cypri-
an, and S. Au-
gustine. Per-
sarum autem
& Macedo-
num imperi-
um usque ad
ipsum Alex-
andrum cui
loquebatur,
plusquam o-
cto millium
annorum ille
constituit;
cum apud
Græcos Ma-
cedonum us-*

que ad mortem Alexandri quadringenti octoginta quinque reperiantur anni, Persarum vero, donec ipsius Alexandri victoria finirentur, ducenti & triginta tres computentur. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 12. c. 10. † as Diodorus Siculus takes notice of the Egyptians, and Abydenus of the Chaldeans, whose ten first Kings reigned 120 Sari. *ὡς τὸς πέντε ἑνὰ βασιλεὺς δὲκα ἑνὶ ἡμέρῃ τῆς βασιλείας* *καὶ ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι.* Now this word *σάρες* was proper to the Babylonian or Chaldean account. Hefyc. *Σάρες, ἀριθμὸς πεντήκοντα τριῶν*, but what this number was he tells us not. In the Fragment of Abydenus preserved by Eusebius, *Σάρες δὲ ἑστὶν ἑκατόν τετραχίλιαι* *ἑκάστη* every *Σάρες* is 3600 years, and consequently the 120 *σάρες* belonging to the reign of the ten Kings 432000 years. Neither was this the account onely of Abydenus, but also of Berosus; neither was the interpretation onely of Eusebius, but also of Alexander Polyhistor, who likewise expresseth *ἑκατὸν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν σάρες ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι, ἡτοι ἑξήκοντα τριῶν καὶ δύο χιλιάδας*. This seemed so highly incredible, that two ancient Monks, Anianus and Panodorus, interpreted those Chaldean years to be but dayes: so that every *σάρες* should consist of 3600 dayes, that is, 9 years 10 moneths and a half, and the whole 120 *σάρες* for the 10 Kings 1183 years 6 moneths and odd dayes. This is all which Ios. Scaliger or Iacobus Goar of late could find concerning this Chaldean Computation: and the first of these complains that none but Hefychius makes mention of this account. I shall therefore supply them not onely with another Authour, but also with a diverse and distinct interpretation. *Σάρες μῆτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς πεντήκοντα τριῶν* *καὶ ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι* *ἑκατὸν τετραχίλιαι* *ἑκάστη* *ἡτοι ἑξήκοντα τριῶν καὶ δύο χιλιάδας*. that is, according to the Translation of Porcius, Sari apud Chaldaeos est mensura & numerus. Nam 120 Sari faciunt annos 2222, qui sunt anni 18 & sex menfes, well might he fix his N L. or non liquet to these words; for as they are in the printed books there is no sense to be made of them; but by the help of the MS. in the Vatican Library we shall both supply the defect in Suidas, and find a third valuation of the *σάρες*. Thus then that MS. represents the words. *Οἱ γὰρ μὲν σάρες πεντήκοντα τριῶν καὶ δύο χιλιάδας ἡτοι ἑξήκοντα τριῶν καὶ δύο χιλιάδας* *ἑκατὸν τετραχίλιαι* *ἑκάστη* *ἡτοι ἑξήκοντα τριῶν καὶ δύο χιλιάδας*. And so the sense is clear. *Σάρες* according to the Chaldean account comprehends 222 months, which come to 18 years and six moneths; therefore 120 *σάρες* make 2220 years, and therefore for *βάρκ*, I read, leaving out the last β, *βάρκ*. that is 2220.

the letters which we use, and languages which we speak; they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first Authors. The first beginnings were then so known and acknowledged by all, that the inventors and authours of them were reckoned amongst their Gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficial: which honour and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

If we search into the Nations themselves, we shall see none without some original: and were those † Authours extant which have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of Cities and Countries, their first rudiments would appear as evident, as their later growth and present condition. We know what wayes within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick woods for their habitations, now as fertile, as populous as any. The Hercynian trees, in the time of the Cæsars, occupying so great a space, as to take up a journey of 60 dayes, were thought even then * coeval with the world. We read without any shew of contradiction, how this Western part of the world hath been peopled from the East: and all the pretence of the Babylonian antiquity is nothing else, but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the Ark, descending from the Gordian mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in the plain of Sinaar, made their first division at that place: and that dispersion, or rather diffemination, hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the Flood.

These Arguments have alwayes seemed so clear and undeniable, that they have put not onely those who make the world eternal, but them also who confesse it made, (but far more ancient then we believe it) to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrational.

For to this they replied, † That this World hath suffered many alterations, by the utter destructions of nations and depopulations of

† I mean, not onely such as wrote the building of particular Cities, as Apollonius Rhodius, Καὶ οὐκ ἴστω, Xenophanes, Κολοφώνος κτίσις, Crito Σουκραστῶν κτίσις, & Philochorus Σαλαμίνος κτίσις: but those more general, as Polemo Κτίσεις πόλεων, & Φακίδης, Χαρόν. Πόλεων κτίσεις, Callimachus Κτίσεις νήσων & πόλεων, Hellanicus Κτίσεις ἰσθμῶν καὶ πόλεων, and the Infinitie Κτίσεις: written by Dercyllus, Dionysius, Hippys, Trisimachus, and others.

¶ Sylvarum, Hercynia dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut major aliis, ita & notior. Met. l. 3. c. 3.

* Hercynia sylvarum roborum vastitas intacta ævis & congenita mundo, prope immortalis sorte miracula excedit. Plin. l. 16. c. 2. † Thus Ocellus, who maintained the world was never made, answers the Argument brought from the Greek Histories which began with Inachus, as the first subject, not authour of History (as Negarola in his Annotations mistakes Ocellus) λέγει τοῖς ἀρχαῖσι τῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ιστορίας ἀρχῆς δὲ τὸ Ἰνάχου εἶναι τὸ Ἀρχαῖον, ἀποκαθ' ὅσον οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τὸ πρῶτον ἀρχαῖον ἀποκαθ' ὅσον, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀρχαίας καταβολῆς καὶ αὐτῆς. So that he will have Inachus to be the first not absolutely, but since the last great alteration made in Greece: and then he concludes that Greece hath often been, and will often be barbarous, and lose the memory of all their actions, Πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ γὰρ ἔστι βαρβαρὰ ἢ Ἑλλάς, ἐχ' ὅτι ἀνθρώπων μόνον γινώσκοντες μνηστέον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως ἡ μείζων ἢ ἐλάττω αὐτῆς γινώσκοντες, ἀλλὰ γὰρ νῦν τῆς αἰῶνος ἀρχῆς ἀρχὴν λαμβάνοντες. Ocellus de Universo, c. 3. Thus Plato, who asserted the creation of the world, but either from eternity, or such antiquity as does not much differ from it, brings in Solon inquiring the age of the Greek Histories, as of Phoroneus and Niobe, Deucalion and Pyrrha; and an Egyptian Priest answering, that all the Greeks were boies, and not an old man amongst them, that is, they had no ancient monuments, or history of any antiquity, but rested contented with the knowledge of the time since the last great mutation of their own country. πολλὰ γὰρ κατὰ πολλὰ φθόρα γινώσκοντες ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἰσθμῶν, πλεῖς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς μνηστέον, μνηστέον δ' ἀδελφοὶ ἡμεῖς βραχυπρόσμων. in Timæo. Origen of Celsus. τὸ πολλὰ ἐκ παλαιῶν αἰώνων γινώσκοντες, πολλὰ δ' ὁμιλοῦντες, καὶ νῦν τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ Διουκλειῶν καὶ καταλυμένων ἰσθμῶν καὶ γινώσκοντες, οὐδὲν αὐτῶν δὲ καταμνηστέον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς τὸ καὶ αὐτῶν τὸ αἶμα ἀφ' ὧν. l. 1. And Lucretius the Epicurean, who thought the world but few thousand years old, as we believe, & that it should at last be consumed, as we also are persuaded; thinks this Answer of theirs so far from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the later part of his opinion. De rerum natura l. 5.

Quod si forte fuisse antehac eadem omnia credis.
Sed periisse hominum torrenti sacra vapore,
Aut cecidisse urbis magno vexamine mundi,
Aut ex imbris assiduis exisse rapaces
Per terras amnes atque oppida cooperuisse:
Tanto quippe magis victus fateare necesse est,
Exitium quoque terrarum cœlique futurum.

Coun-

† Ἐγώσαν ὁ τῷ
Κέλσῳ πρὸς τὸν
ἀπὸ ἐκπύρωσιν
καὶ ἐξυδατώσιν
τοῦτο διδόντα
τοὶ κατ' αὐτὸν
Σοφοῖται Αἰ-
γύπτιοι.

Orig. adv.

Celsum. l. i.

* So that E-
gyptian Priest
in Plato's Ti-
maeus tells So-
lon, that the
Fable of Phae-
thon did signi-
fy a real con-
flagration of
the world; but
so as all they
which lived in
mountains or
drie parts of
the earth were
scorched and
consumed, but
of those which
lived near the
seas or rivers
in the valleys,
some were pre-
served, ἡμῶν δὲ
σαῖν he, ὁ
Νεῖλος ἐστὶν
τοῦτο ἐν ταύτῃ
τῇ Σοφίᾳ σά-
ζειν λέγουσι.
Thus the EGY-
ptians pretend
Nilus saved
them from the
flames of Phae-
thon. Nor
were they one-
ly safe from
conflagrations,
but from in-
undations also.
For when in
Greece, or o-
ther parts a
deluge hap-
pens, then all
their cities

were swept away into the Sea: κατὰ δὲ τὴνδε * γῶγον, says the Priest, ἐπεὶ τότε, ἐπὶ ἀμορτὶ ἀναβὴν ὄντι τὰς ἀρέρας
ὕδαρ ὀμφεῖ· τὸ δ' ἑαυτοῦ κατωδὴν ἱππῆσιν πέφυκ' ἔδει καὶ δι' αἰτίας τ' ἀνὰ δὲ Καζόδωκα λίγῳ παλαιότατα.
So Egypt receiving not their waters from above by clouds, but from below by springs filling the river Nile,
was out of danger in a Deluge, and thereby preserved the most ancient monuments and records. But alas, this
is a poor shift to them which believe that in the great and universal Flood, all the fountains of the great
deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, Gen. 7.11. * So Cicero indeed speaks,
innumabilia secula, in his book of Divination: and Socrates in Plato's Theætetus brings this argument
against the pride of great and noble families, that they which mention a succession of their Ancestors which
have been rich and powerful, do it merely τὸ ἀπαίδευτος, ἢ δουραμένῳ εἰς τὸ πᾶν αἰεὶ βλάπτεν, ἔδδ' ἡσυχῆσαι,
ἐν πάμπαν καὶ κορυφαίῳ μισθῷ ἐκείνῳ γένεσιν ἀναριθμήτοι, ἐν αἷσι πλάσσει καὶ πύργῳ, καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ δόλῳ,
βασιλεῖσι τε καὶ Ἑλλήνεσι πολλοῖσι μισθοῖς γένεσιν ὅτιον· as if every person were equally honourable, having in-
numerable ancestors rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous.

* Origen

* Origen did fondly seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the Scriptures; yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the Chronology of the sacred writ, we shall find no mans pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the world, we find ten generations extend to 1656 years, according to the shortest, which is thought, because the Hebrew, therefore the best account, according to the longest, which, because the Septuagints, is not to be contemned, 2262, or rather 2256. From the Flood, brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, unto the birth of Abraham, the Father of the faithful, not above ten generations, if so many, took up 292 years, according to the least, 1132 according to the largest account. Since which time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long; and it is agreed by all that there have not passed since the birth of Abraham 3700 years. Now by the experience of our families which for their honour and greatness have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred Scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed Evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgement of former ages, three † generations usually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet 3700 years since the birth of Abraham, as certainly it is not, if all men which are or have been since have descended from Noah, as undoubtedly they have, if Abraham were but the tenth from Noah, as Noah from Adam, which Moses hath assured us; then is it not probable that any person now alive is above 130 generations removed from Adam. And indeed thus admitting but the Greek account of less than 5000 years since the Flood, we may easily bring all sober or probable Accounts of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Chineses, to begin since the dispersion at Babel. Thus having expressed at last the time, so far as it is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second Consideration of the nature and notion of Creation.

Now being under the terms of *heaven and earth* we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing; the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he which made all things is God. This truth is so evident in it self, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withal affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, then to assert God so the Creatour of the world, as he is described in this Article.

generations from father to son: as in S. Mat. i. 17. Indeed sometimes they take it for other spaces of time as Artemidorus observes for 7 years. Καὶ εἶπε μὴ ἐστ' ἡ. ὅταν καὶ λίγιστοι οἱ ἱαλεῖκοι, ὅτι δύο ἤμεραν (not πῶς ἦν, as Wolphius and Porius would correct it) μάλιστα (not μὴ δὲν, as Suidas) φρεσδομοῖν, ἢ παρασκευάζειν (not παρασκευάζειν, as Suidas transcribing him negligently λίγιστοι. Sometimes they interpret it 20. 25. or 30. years, as appears by Hesychius. And by that last account they reckoned the years of Nestor. καὶ εἶπε ὁ λ'. ὅταν καὶ ἡ Νέστορος βέλοισιται ἐπὶ ἐννενήκοντα. ἢ γερονία, so Arsemidorus and the Grammarians. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of Homer. 'Ta. a'.

Τῷ δ' ἡδὴ δόξοι μὲν γλυκὴ μετ' ἅπαν ἀνθρώπων
Ἐφ' ἡβῇ, οἱ δὲ ἀποδιδόναι ἅμα τέρπειν ἡδ' ἐγχεῖν.

And I conceive that gloss in Helychius, *ἐν τῷ ἐπιστολῇ* καὶ αὐτὸ βαλμωμένον, to be far more properly applicable to that place. But, in the sense of which now we speak, it is taken for the third part ordinarily of an hundred years: as Herodotus mentioning the Egyptian feigned genealogies: καὶ τοὶ γενεαλογεῖν ἀνθρώπων ἔτησι διακρίται πέντε χίλια, 300 generations equalize 1000 years, *ἡλικία τρεῖς αἰῶνες καὶ ἑκατὶ ἔτη*. And after him Clemens Alex. Strom. l. 2. *εἰς τὰς κατὰ τὴν τρεῖς καὶ ἑκατὶ αἰῶνας ἔτησι*.

* Origen did not only collect the eternity of the world from the coexistence of all Gods attributes, as because he is *πανταχθως*, and *διωκεως*, therefore he was always so, (for how could he be *διωκεως*: *αδελφου διωκεως* *αυτου*, or *πανταχθως αδελφου* *αυτου* *αδελφου* *αυτου*) but also from the 90 Psalm: From everlasting to everlasting thou art God. For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday, and that at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus; Who can number the sand of the sea, and the drops of the rain, and the dayes of eternity? But Methodius, Bishop and Martyr, hath well concluded that

By the Greeks
called *ἡμετέρας*,
which are suc-
cessions of ge-

Being

a Gen. 1. 31.

* Inde Manichæus, ut Deum à conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit autorem. S. Hier. in Nahum c. 3.

† For we must

not look upon

Manes as the

first authour

of the Heresy,

though they

which follow-

ed him were

called from

him Mani-

chæans. Nor

must we be sa-

tisfied with

the relation of

Socrates, who

allois the be-

ginning of that

Heresy *ἡ αἵρεσις*

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

ἡ αἵρεσις

Being then we believe in God the Father maker of heaven and earth, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the Deity; our first assertion which we must make good, is, that the one God did create the world. Again, being whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of Creation, as being an emanation of the Divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter shew that we believe some other persons to be the same God; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the Creation of the world is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of it self, it is so obvious to all which have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied, (as there is nothing so senseless, but some kind of hereticks have imbraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better then of the former) I shall briefly declare the Creation of the world to have been performed by that one God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world, as to inferre a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their original any way derogatory to the Creatour. *a God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good,* and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit alwayes to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil, is not so by the Creatours action, but by the creatures defection.

In vain then did the Hereticks of old, to remove a seeming inconvenience, renounce a certain truth, and whilst they * fear'd to make their own God evil, they made him partial, or but half the Deity, and even so a companion at least with an evil God. For dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil, and substantially good, and apprehending a necessity of an origination conformable to so different a condition, they imagined one God essentially good, as the first principle of the one, another God essentially evil, as the original of the other. And this strange Heresie began upon the first † spreading of the Gospel; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow.

Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, (not Vrbicus, as S. Aug.) who disseminated this Heresy in the dayes of Aurelianus or Probus the Emperour, about the year 277. had a Predecessor, though not a Master, call'd first Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and estate to a widow, who, saith Epiphanius, *ἡ αἵρεσις τοῦ τερβίνθου*, continued with his estate and books a long time, and at last bought Cubricus for her servant. This Buddas had a former Master called Scythianus, the first authour of this Heresy. Beside these, between Scythianus and Cubricus there was yet another teacher of the doctrine, called Zaranes. *ἡ αἵρεσις τοῦ ζαράνης*. If then we insert this Zaranes into the Manichæan Pedegree, and consider the time of the widow between Buddas and Cubricus, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but seven years old, as Socrates testifies, when she resolved to buy him, and discover the Heresy to him; there will be no reason to doubt of the relation of Epiphanius, that Scythianus began in the Apostolical times. Nor need we any of the abatements in the Animadversions of Petavius, much lesse that redargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an assertour of the Christian Faith against this Heresy: For though he certainly died before Manes spread his doctrine, yet it was written in several books before him, not onely in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates and Suidas attribute them, but of Scythianus, whom S. Cyril and Epiphanius make the authour of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manichæans before the appearance of Manes; for I conceive the name of Manes, (thought by the Greeks to be a name taken up by Cubricus, and proper to him) not to be any proper or peculiar name at all, but the general title of Heretick in the Syriac tongue. For I am loath to think that Theodoret or the Authour in Suidas were so far mistaken, when they call Scythianus Mares, as to conceive Cubricus and he were the same person: when we may with much better reason conclude that both Scythianus and Cubricus had the same title. For I conceive Manes at first rather a title then a name, from the Hebrew מָנֶסֶס or מָנֶסֶס signifying a Heretick. And although some of the Rabbins derive their מָנֶסֶס from Manes, yet others make it more

Whereas

ancient then he was, referring it to Trzadok and Bajethos called *ἡρώδης*, the first or chief Hereticks, who lived 100 years before Christ. Wherefore it is far more rational to assert, that he which began the Heresy of the Manichees was called *ἡρώδης* as an Heretick in the Oriental tongues, and from thence *Manes* by the Greeks, (to comply with *mania* or madnesse in their language) then that *Manes* was first the name of a man counted an Heretick by the Christians, and then made the general name for all Hereticks, and particularly for the Christians by the Jews. which being granted, both *Scythianus* and *Cubricus* might well at first have the name of *Manes*, that is Heretick. However the antiquity of that heresy will appear in the Marcionites, who differed not in this particular from the Manichees. *Duos Ponticus Deos* assert tanquam duas *Symplegadas naufragii sui*: quem negare non potuit, id est, creatorem, id est nostrum; & quem probare non potuit, id est, suum. *Pallus infelix* hujus præsumptionis instinctum de simplici capitulo *Dominicæ* pronuntiationis, in homines non in Deos disponentis exempla illa bonæ & malæ arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus. *Tertul.* l. i. c. 2. This Marcion lived in the days of Antoninus Pius, and as Eusebius testifieth, Iustine Martyr wrote against him. *Hist.* l. 4. c. 11. Irenæus relates how he spake with Polycarpus Bishop of Smyrna, who was taught by the Apostles, and conversed with divers which saw our Saviour, l. 3. c. 3. Neither was Marcion the first which taught it at Rome, for he received it from Cerdon. *Habuit & Cerdonem* quendam informatorem scandalum hujus, quo facilius duos Deos æci estimaverunt. This Cerdon succeeded Heracleon, and so at last this Heresy may be reduced to the Gnosticks, who derived it from the old Gentile Philosophers, and might well be embraced by *Manes* in Persia, because it was the doctrine of the Persian Magi, as Aristotle testifieth. *Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν περὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν βιβλίῳ τῷ τρίτῳ κεφάλαιον α'* *ἡρώδης* ὁ καλεῖται ὁ πρώτος ὁ καλεῖται ὁ πρώτος ὁ καλεῖται ὁ πρώτος. *Laert.* in præmio. And this derivation is well observed by Timotheus Presbyter of Constantinople speaking thus of *Manes*. *παρὰ δὲ Μανιχαίων καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀποχρησάντων καὶ διωγμένων καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Περσῶν μυστικῶν ἀπορρητῶν καὶ λαθῶν δογματικῶν οὐκ ἀρχαί.*

Whereas there is no nature originally sinfull, no substance in it self evil, and therefore no being which may not come from the same fountain of goodnesse. *a I form the light, and create darknesse, I make peace, and create evil, I the Lord do all these things,* saith he who also said, *I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me.* Vain then is that conceit which fram'd two Gods, one of them called light, the other darknesse; one good, the other evil, refuted in the first words of the Creed, *I believe in God, maker of heaven and earth.*

But as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we yet further shew that one God the Father to be the Maker of the world. In which there is no difficulty at all: the whole Church at Jerusalem hath sufficiently declared this truth in their devotions; *Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child Iesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* Iesus then was the childe of that God which made the heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the Creatour of the world.

We know that Christ is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave him, by his frequent assertion; we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of Christ is the Creatour of the world, by the Prophets expresse prediction: For, *thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he which spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.*

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty; for being the Apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the Prophets, that by the Spirit they were produc'd, how can we attribute that peculiarly in the Creed unto the Father, which in the Scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son, and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be render'd of this peculiar attributing the work of Creation to the Father. First, in respect of those Heresies arising

sing in the infancy of the Church, which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another Creatour of the world, distinguish'd from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An error so destructive to the Christian religion, that it raseth even the foundations of the Gospel, which refers it self wholly to the promises in the Law, and pretends to no other God, but that God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, then him that spake by the Prophets; and therefore whom Moses and the Prophets call Lord of heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoycing in spirit, and saying, ^a *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* Secondly, in respect of the Paternal priority in the Deity, by reason whereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first Person in the Trinity. In which respect the Apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production, ^b *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* And our Saviour hath acknowledged, *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do;* which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the Person. And in this sense the Church did always profess to believe in God the Father

* Creatour of heaven and earth.

The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth several wayes, as indispensably tending to the illustration of Gods glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the averſion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective: and the splendour of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his hands. ^c *The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.*

^d *For he hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.* After a long enumeration of the wonderful works of the creation, the Psalmist breaketh forth into this pious meditation, ^e *O Lord how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.* If then the glory of God be made apparent by the creation, if he have ^f *made all things for himself,* that is, for the manifestation of his glorious attributes, if the ^g *Lord rejoyceth in his works,* because *his glory shall endure for ever;* then is it absolutely necessary we should confesse him *Maker of heaven and earth,* that we may sufficiently praise and glorifie him. ^h *Let them praise the name of the Lord,* saith David, *for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven.* Thus did the Levites teach the children of Israel to glorifie God. ⁱ *Stand up, and blesse the Lord your God for ever and ever: and blessed be thy glorious name which is exalted above all blessing and praise.* Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens; with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein.

And the same hath S. Paul taught us. ^k *For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen.* Furthermore, that we may be assured that he which made both heaven and earth, will be glorified in both, the Prophet calls upon all those celestial hosts to bear their part in this hymne. ^l *Praise ye him all his Angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him Sun and Moon, praise*

^a Luke 10. 21.

^b 1 Cor. 8. 6.

* *Stabat fides semper in Creatore & Christo ejus. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. Non alia agnoscenda erit traditio Apostolorum, quam quæ hodie apud ipsorum Ecclesias editur. Nullam autem Apostolici census Ecclesiam invenias quæ non in Creatore Christianizet. ib.*

^c Rom. 1. 20.

^d Jer. 10. 12.

^e Psal. 115.

^f Psal. 104. 24.

^g Pro. 16. 4.

^h Psal. 104. 31.

ⁱ Psal. 148. 13.

^j Neh. 9. 5, 6.

^k Rom. 11. 36.

^l Psal. 148. 2,

3, 4, 5.

praise him all ye Stars of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded, and they were created. And the 24 Elders in the Revelation of S. John, *a* fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their Crowns, the emblemes of their borrowed and derived glories, before the Throne, the seat of infinite and eternal Majesty, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created. Wherefore, if the heavens declare the glory of God, and all his works praise him, then shall his Saints blesse him, they shall speak of the glory of his kingdome, and talk of his power. And if man be silent, God will speak; while we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate: *I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power, and by my out-stretched arm.*

a Rev. 4. 10, 11.

Psal. 19. 1.
Psal. 145. 10, 11.

Ier. 27. 5.

Secondly, the doctrine of the worlds Creation is most properly effectual towards mans humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity then pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone then that; so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, then a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflexion upon our own original. *d* When I consider the heavens the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glasse find greater numbers, before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I contemplate those far more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the Prophet, *What is man that thou art mindful of him? what is that off-spring of the earth, that dust and ashes? what is that Son of man that thou visitest him? what is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned Father, that thou shouldest look down from heaven the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our original ought so far to humble us, how should our fall abase us? That of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his maker, and would be equal unto him from whom he new received his being. All other works of God, which we think inferiour to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending of their Maker: The glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entred upon the greatest happinesse of which the workmanship of God is capable: But men, the sons of fallen Adam, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the onely companions of those *e* Angels which left their own habitations, and are *f* delivered into chains of darknesse, to be reserved unto judgement. How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in the sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance? How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded by Moses, who first penned the*

d *Psal.* 8. 3.

e *Iude* 6.

f 2 *Per.* 2. 4.

K

original

^a Gen. 6. 6. original of humanity, ^a *It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart?*

Thirdly, this Doctrine is properly efficacious and productive of most chearful and universal obedience. It made the Prophet call for the Commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know what he should obey. ^b *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding that I may learn thy Commandments.* By vertue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most exact and compleat obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of Gods goodnesse, none ever disobeyed his voice but the Devil and Man. ^c *Mine hand saith he, hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens, when I call unto them they stand up together.* The most loyal and obedient servants which stand continually before the most illustrious Prince, are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their sovereign Lord, as all the Hosts of heaven and earth attend upon the will of their Creatour. ^d *Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatnesse of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth, but every one maketh his appearance, ready prest to observe the designs of their Commander in chief.* Thus the Lord commanded, and ^e *they fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.* ^f *He commanded the Ravens to feed Elias, and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening; and so one Prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the fowls of the air.* He spake to the devouring Whale, ^g *and it vomited out Ionah upon the dry lands* and so another Prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the fishes of the sea. Do we not read of ^h *fire and haile, snow and vapour, stormy wind fulfilling his word?* Shall there be a greater coldnesse in man then in the snow? more vanity in us then in a vapour? more inconstancy then in the wind? If the universal obedience of the creature to the will of the Creatour cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him, they will all conspire to testifie against us and condemn us, when God shall call unto them, saying, ⁱ *Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.*

Lastly, the Creation of the world is of most necessary meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions. ^k *Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, which made heaven, and earth, the sea and all that therein is.* This happinesse consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfie us. ^l *The earth is the Lords, and the fulnesse thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.* For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods. By vertue of the first production he hath a perpetual right unto, and power to dispose of all things: and he which can order and dispose of all must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and satisfie any Creature. ^m *Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creatour of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?* There is no external resistance or opposition where omnipotency worketh, no internal weaknesse or defection

defection of power where the Almighty is the Agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm perswasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again this happinesse consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this Meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us. *a My help cometh from the Lord who made heaven and earth, he will not suffer thy foot to be moved,* saith the Prophet David, at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security. God *b will not despise the work of his hands*, neither will he suffer the rest of his Creatures to do the least injury to his own image. *c Behold,* saith he, *I have created the Smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.*

a Psal. 121.

2, 3.

b Job 10. 3.

c Isa. 54. 16;

17.

Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first Article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof, that every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession of my faith in the *Maker of heaven and earth*, I do truly profess, that I really believe, and am fully perswaded, that both heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation; so that antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the world merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alledged, no motive assigned, but his goodnesse; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within one hundred and thirty generations of men, most certainly within not more then six thousand yeares. I acknowledge this God Creatour of the world to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: and in this full latitude, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*

ARTICLE II.

And in Iesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

THe second Article of the Creed presents unto us, as the object of our faith, the second Person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and the Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually express'd by a constant conjunction in our Christian Confession. And that upon no lesse authority then of the *Authour and Finisher of our faith*, who in the persons of the Apostles gave this command to us, *a Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* Nor speaketh he this of himself, but from the Father which sent him; *b for this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Iesus Christ.* According therefore to the Sons prescription, the Fathers injunction, and the Sacramental institution, as we are baptized, so do we *†* believe in the name of the Father, and the Son.

a Iohn 14. 1.

b I Iohn 3. 23.

† Eadem Regula veritatis

docet nos

credere post

Patrem etiam

in Filium

Dei, Christum

Iesum

Domini.

Deum nostrum;

sed Dei filium:

hujus Dei qui & unus & solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omnium. Novatianus De Trinit. cap. 9.

Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a threefold description: first, by his Nomination, as *Iesus Christ*; secondly, by his Generation, as the *only Son* of God; thirdly, by his Dominion, as *our Lord*.

But when I reterre *Iesus Christ* to the Nomination of our Saviour, because he is in the Scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called *Iesus*, sometimes *Christ*, I would be understood so as not to make each of them equally, or in like propriety, his Name. *His name was called Iesus, which was so named of the Angel before he was conceived in the wombe; d who is also called Christ*, not by * name, but by office and title. Which observation, seemingly triviall, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the Article: for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, and so resolve our faith into these two propositions. I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance *Iesus*, the Saviour of the world. I believe the man who bare that name to be the *Christ*, that is, the *Messias* promised of old by God, and expected by the Jews.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the custome of the Jewes, at his circumcision: and as the Baptist was called *John*, even so the Christ was called *Iesus*. Beside, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name it self of ordinary use. We read in the Scriptures of *e Iesus which was called Justus, a fellow-worker* with S. Paul, and of a *certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name was Barjesus*, that is, the son of *Iesus*. Josephus in his History mentioneth one *Iesus* the son of Ananus, another the son of Saphates, a third the son of Judas, slain in the Temple: and many of the High Priests, or Priests, were called by that name, as the son of *Damnæus*, of *Gamaliel*, of *Onias*, of *Phabes*, and of *Thebuth*. Ecclesiasticus is call'd the *Wisdom of Iesus* the son of *Sirach*, and that *Sirach* the son of another *Iesus*. † S. Steven speaks of the *Tavernacle of witness brought in with Iesus into the possession of the Gentiles*: and the Apostle in his explication of those words of David, *g To day if ye will hear his voice*, observeth, that if *Iesus* had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day. Which two Scriptures being undoubtedly understood of *Joshua* the son of Nun, teach us as infallibly that *Iesus* is the same name with *Joshua*. Which being at the first † imposition in the full extent of pronunciation *Jehoshua*, in proësse of time contracted to *Ieshuah*, by the omission of the last letter (strange and difficult to other languages) and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Iesus*.

Wherefore it will be necessary for the proper interpretation of *Iesus*, to look back upon the first that bare that name, who was the son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the successor of Moses, and so named by him, as it is written, *h And Moses called Oshea the son of*

Lu ke 2. 21.
d Matt. I. 16.
* Si tamen
nomen est
Christus, &
non appella-
tio potius;
Unctus enim
significatur.
Unctus au-
tem non ma-
gis nomen est
quam vesti-
tus, quam
calceatus, ac-
cicens nomi-
ni res. Tertul.
adv. Prax.
c. 28. Quo-
rū nominiū
alterū est
propriū,
quod ab An-
gelo imposi-
tum est, alte-
rū accidens,
quod ab un-
ctione conve-
nit: Ib. Chri-
stus com-
mune digni-
tatis est no-
men, Iesus
propriū vo-
cabulum Sal-
vatoris. S. Hie-
ron. in Mat.
16. 20. Iesus
inter homi-
nes nomina-
tur; nam
Christus non
propriū no-
men est, sed
nuncupatio
potestatis &
regni. Lat. em.
de Falsa Sap.
lib. 4. c. 7.

Dum dicitur Christus, commune nomen dignitatis est, dum Iesus Christus, proprium vocabulum Salvatoris est. *Isid. Orig. l. 7. c. 2. Iesus apud grecos significat. S. Cyr. Catech. 10. c. Col. 4. 11. Act. 13. 6. Habuit & Judæa quosdam Iesus, quorum vacuum gloriatur vocabulis. Illa enim nec lucent, nec pascunt, nec medentur. Bernard, in Cant. Serm. 15. f. Act. 7. 41. g Heb. 4. 8. † First ywrr as generally in the books of Moses, in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, the Kings, yet even in Haggai and Zachariah: then contracted into yw, as in the 1 Chron. 24. 11. 2 Chron. 31. 15. and constantly in Ezra and Nehemiah. Next the last letter y was but lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek translation 1 Chro. 7. 27. where ywrr is rendered in the Roman and Alexandrian Copy Iwrr, in the Aldus and Complutensian Editions Iwrr, and by Eusebium, who expresseth it ever then those Copies, Iwrr. At last y was totally left out both in the pronunciation and the writing, and the whole name of Ieshuah contracted to w. h Numb. 13. 16.*

Nun

i Num. 13. 16.
k 1 Chr. 27. 20.
l 2 King. 17. 1.
Hof. 1. 1.

* Ofsee in lingua nostra Salvatorem sonat, quod nomen habuit etiam Josue filius Nun, antequam ei a Deo vocabulum mutaretur. *S. Hieron.* in Ofsee c. 1. v. 1. & lib. 1. adv. Iovinianum. I read indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks; no good expositors of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient MS. of the LXX Translation of the Prophets.

now in the Library of Cardinal Barberini, at the beginning of Hoseah, ὡς, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὧς, and again, ὡς, καταρχήν, ἢ καταρχῇ. Of which the first and last are far from the Original, and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduc'd from γω not in Niphal, but in Hiphil. † As the Samaritan Pentateuch makes it the same name, which he was first named, and which he had afterwards; as if Moses had onely called Oshea, Oshoa, † So Iustine Martyr speaks of Hoseah as μετονομασθέντα πρὸς Ἰησοῦν ἐβραϊκά. And comparing it with that alteration of Jacobs name; πρὸς Ἰησοῦν ἰακώβ πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἐβραϊκά. Διότι Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ τὸ Ἀυοὺ ὅμοια ἱερὲς ἱκανάκιον, where, so passe by his mistake in supposing him first named Israel, and after called Jacob, he makes the alteration of Hoseah to Ischia, equal to that of Jacob to Israel. The reason whereof was the Greek version of the name, who for Hoseah translated it 'Αυοὶ: ἰσραήλιστα Μωϋσε πρὸς Ἀυοὺ ὑφ' ἑκατὸ Νεούτ. Num. 13. 17. Dum Moyfi successor destinaretur Aules filius Nave, transfertur cente de prilitio nomine, & incipit vocari Iesus. Terent. adv. Rud. & adv. Micion. l. 3. §. 16. Igitur Moyfes his administrans Aulem quandam nomine proponens populo qui eos revocaret ad patriam terram. Clem. l. 1. Recognir. Qui cum primium Aules vocaretur Moses iussit eum Iesum vocari. Laët. de Vera. Sap. c. 17. ἡ μεταγενέστερη (Μωϋσὴς τὸ αὐτὸ διαδομένη) τῇ πρὸς Ἰησοῦ κεχρημένῃ μεταγωγῇ, ἐπιδείκνυσι δὲ ἵνα πρὸς Ἀυοί, ὅπου οἱ Ἰουδαῖοις αὐτῷ τίθενται κατέδρον, Ἱεροὺ αὐτοῦ ἀπαγορεύει. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 1. c. 3. Thus was the Hoseah something disguised by Aules, and was farther estranged yet by those which frequently called him Nevoût, as Ensef. Demons. Ev. l. 4. c. 17. shrice. * This Iustin Martyr charges upon the Jews as neglected by, and affirms the reason why they received not Jesus for the Christ, was their not observing the alteration of Hoseah into J-shua or Jesus. Αὐτοὶ κρυψάντων ἱερὲς Μωϋσὴς ἀλάστον ἑστῶτος ἐν ἑλέει: διὰ ἣν ἀστία πίπτουν, καὶ καταπεύ, ἐπὶ σπονδισίαι. τετραγώνι κἀκεῖθεν οὐ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀποχρησμένοι ἑσονται. — And whereas they speak much of the change made in the names of Abram and Sarai, which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this total alteration of the name, so here: καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἑκατὸν νεοῦτα πρὸς Ἀγαμέμνονα μεταγωγή, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ πατρὶς ἐβραϊκῇ, ἰσραὴλ κατωνομασθέντα διὰ τὸ εἰς τὸ πελεθρὸν ὀνομα. τὸ Ἀυοί τὰ ὑφ' ἑκατὸν λαλοῦμεθα πρὸς ἑκατὸν, ἢ ἑλίαι. Where, as we passe by the vulgar mistake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of s in the name of Abraham, and p in the name of Sarah, when the first was an addition of n, the second a change of t into r, he would make that of Hosea into Iesus far more considerable alteration, then that of Abraham or of Sarah. πρὸς πρὸς † For it may well be thought that s is added to make the name πρὸς the same with the third person of the future in Hiphil, πρὸς. For although the characteristicall letter of the conjugation Hiphil, does conclude in the future tense, and as the regular word be πρὸς frequently in use; yet sometimes it is expressed, as it is used 1 Sam. 17. 47. וְנָתַן יְהוָה בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה וּבְיַד אֹרֹן וְכָל הָעָם יָדְעוּ כִּי ה' עִמָּנוּ. I was brought low, and he helped me. And although there be another s in the future, then in the name, yet being it is also

and

found sometimes with the lesser Chiric, and so without the latter, or without any Chiric at all, as frequently with the addition of י, Yod, there is no reason but Yod the name of the Son of Nun, may be of the same force, as consisting of the same letters, with the third person of the Future in Hiphil. Again, being added to the Future, as formative thereof, stands in the place of י (for the avoiding of confusion with a conjunctive) which is nothing else then the abbreviation of Yod, we may well assign at least this Emphasis to the mutation which Moses made; that whereas before there was nothing but salvation barely in his name, now there is no less then he shall save, in which the Yod or י is a peculiar designation of the person, and the shall or Tense, a certainty of the futurition. Thus will the design of Moses appear to be nothing else but a prediction or confirmation of that which was not before, but by way of desire or omination; and this only by changing the Imperative into the Future, Yod Serv, the expectation of the people, Yod Serv Serv, the ratification of Moses.

and in the signification understood. For being the first letter of *Hoseab* will not endure a duplication, and if the same letter were to be added, one of them must be absorp't; 'tis possible another of the same might be by Moses intended, and one of them suppress'd. If then unto the name *Hoseab* we joyn one of the titles of God, which is *Jah*, there will result from both, by the custome of that Hebrew tongue, *Iehoshuah*; and so not onely the * instrumental, but also the original cause of the Jews deliverance will be found exprest in one word: as if Moses had said, this is the person by whom God will save his people from their enemies.

[illegible]

strangely mistaken it. Mat. 1. 1. Τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὁμαζύει Ἐλισάβητον ἢ δὴ Ἐλεῖον, ἢ μὴδ' αὖ ὡς οὐκ, ἰαὼ γὰρ ὁ Κορμαλὸς παρ' Ἐλεῖον λέγεται. which words seem plainly to signify that Jesus is interpreted Saviour, because Iad in the Hebrew tongue signifieth salvation, I confesse the words may be strained to the same sense with those of Eusebius, but not without some force, and contrary to what he seemeth to intend: Especially considering those which followed him in the same mistake, as Meschopolus, αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς καὶ ἰαὼ γινώσκοντες, ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ παρ' Ἐλεῖον λέγεται Κορμαλ. Whereas Iad in Eusebius is certainly no other then ἰαὼ, and ἰαὼ then ἰωσὺ, and so ἰωσὺ, contracted of ἰαὼ ἰωσὺ, the salvation of God, Nor is this only the opinion of Eusebius, but of S. Hierome, a man much better acquainted with the Hebrew language; who on the first Chapter of Hoseah, shewing that Iosuah had first the same name with that of the Prophet, saith; Non enim (ut male in Græcis codicibus legitur & Latinis) Ioseph dictus est, quod nihil omnino intelligitur; sed Osee, id est, Salvator: & additum est ejus nomen Dominus, ut Salvator Domini diceretur. What then was it but ^{the} Dominus added to his name? For as in the name of Eliaſas S. Hierome acknowledged the addition of the name of God, Interpretator autem Eliaſas Salvator Domini; in the same manner did he conceive it in the name of Iosuah, only with this difference, that in the one it begins, in the other concludes the name. a Luke 1. 31. * Iesus Hebrew sermone, Salvator dicitur. Etymologiam ergo nominis ejus Evangelista signavit, dicens, Vocabis nomen ejus Iesum, quia ipse saluum faciet populum suum S. Hieron.

in *Iofuah* as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons. First, because it is not barely said that *He*, but as the Original raiseth it, * *He himself shall save*. *Iofuah* saved Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God: whereas *Iesus* himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God. Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour*. Secondly, Immediately upon the prediction of the name of *Iesus*, and the interpretation given by the Angel, the Evangelist expressly observeth, *b All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us*. Several ways have been invented to shew the fulfilling of that prophesie, notwithstanding our Saviour was not call'd *Emmanuel*; but none can certainly appear more proper, then that the sense of *Emmanuel* should be comprehended in the name of *Iesus*; and what else is *God with us*, then *God our Saviour*? Well therefore hath the Evangelist conjoyned * the Prophet and the Angel, asserting Christ was therefore named *Iesus*, because it was foretold he should be called *Emmanuel*, the Angelical *God the Saviour* being in the highest propriety the Prophetical *God with us*.

However the constant scripture-interpretation of this name is *Saviour*. So said the Angel of the Lord to the amazed shepherds, *c Unto you is born this day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord*. So S. Paul to the Jews and Gentile Profelytes at Antioch: *d Of this mans seed hath God according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour Iesus*. Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world, then was the name it self so often us'd before. For the ancient Grecians usually gave it at first as a title to their † Gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they stiled *Savi-*

themians, as well it might be, who had his temple in their Piræum, as Strabo testifieth, 1. 9. (where Demosthenes by vertue of a Decree was to build him an Altar, Plut. in Vita Dem.) and his Porch in the City, which was called indeed vulgarly, αὐτοῦ ἑλευθερίου τοῦ θεοῦ yet was it also named αὐτοῦ σωτήρος, as Harpocration and Hesychius have observed. Ὁν δὲ σωτήρος αὐτοῦ ἑλευθερίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἑλευθερίου, ὁ αὐτοῦ ἑλευθερίου τοῦ θεοῦ. So the first. Τὸν Μάγον ἰσχυρότερον τοῦ ἑλευθερίου τοῦ θεοῦ, αὐτοῦ ἑλευθερίου τοῦ θεοῦ. So the later. As in their oaths, so in their feasts they mentioned him alwayes at the third cup. Τὸν μὲν τρίτον αὐτοῦ Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἑλευθερίου, τὸν δὲ τρίτον αὐτοῦ, sub. αὐτοῦ. which is omitted in Hesychius, as appears out of Athenaus. 1. 2. & 15. and especially that of Alexis the Comedian: Ἄν' ἕρπον' αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Pausanias in Corinthiacis, Messenicis, Laconicis & Arcadicis, mentions several Statues and Temples anciently dedicated to Iupiter Ὀλυμπίου σωτήρος. And though this Title was so generally given to Iupiter, as that Hesychius expounds σωτήρος, ὁ αὐτοῦ, yet was it likewise attributed to the other gods: as Herodotus relates how the Grecians in their Naval war against the Persians, made their vower Προσέδωκεν σωτήρος, and that they preserved the Title to Neptune in his dayes. 1. 7. And Artemidorus takes notice that Castor and Pollux are taken for the αὐτοῦ σωτήρος, whom the Poem bearing the name of Orpheus to Musæus calls σωτήρος αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. as the Hymne of Homer, σωτήρος αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. Hence Lucian in Alexandro useth it as their constant title, αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. Neither have we mention of the Title onely, but of the Original, and occasion of it. For when Castor and Pollux thrust the sons of Theseus out of Athens, and made Menestheus King, he gave them first this name, δια τὴν αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. as the Hymne of Homer, αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. Asian. Var. Hist. 1. 4. c. 5. Beside these, we read in the ancient Inscriptions, Ἀρχαῖα αὐτοῦ σωτήρος. and again, Ἀρχαῖα αὐτοῦ σωτήρος. For as they had their Female Deities, so did they attribute this title to their Goddesses, and that both in the masculine and the feminine Gender. As to Venus, Ἀφροδίτη αὐτοῦ σωτήρος καὶ σωτήρος. to Diana, Ἀρtemis αὐτοῦ σωτήρος, as the same collection of Inscriptions hath it. Thus Pherecrates. Ἐγὼ μὲν αὐτοῦ σωτήρος, and Sophocles, Τὸν αὐτοῦ σωτήρος. Thus the Epigram extant in Suidas, σωτήρος αὐτοῦ σωτήρος. ὁ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ. The Pagenses an ancient people in Peloponnesus, Ἀργεῖοι αὐτοῦ σωτήρος. Paus. in Laconicis. Her temple and statue in the city Træzen, was built and named by

Theseus at his safe return from Crete. The Megarenses preserved by her from the Persians, τῇ τούτῳ Σωτεινῇ ἀγαθὰ ἐποίησαντο Ἀργείοις &c. and upon the same occasion another of the same bignesse set up at Pagæ. Id. But this title especially was given to Minerva. Σωτεινὴ ἡ Ἀθάνα πατρὶς τοῖς Ἑλλήσι. Hesych. Ἐστὶ γὰρ Ἀθήνη Σω-
τεινὴ λεγούσα καὶ παύσητος. Schol. Aristoph. in Reus. Aristotle in his Will obliged Nicanor to a dedication, διὸ Σωτήρ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ Σωτήρ. Laert. in Vit. Arif. and in general they invocated God under the notion of Σωτήρ, as Plato in Timæo. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πῶς ἐπ' ἀρχῇ τῶν πραγμάτων Σωτῆρ ἐξ ἀτόπου καὶ αὐτὸς διακρίνας σὺν τῷ θεῷ εὐνοῦν διόγαγε διακρίων καὶ ἐπιταλάων ἀδελφοί, πολλὰν ἀνέμειξε λαῷν.

† This was the constant title of the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagos, given to him by the Rhodians. Ὁνόμαζα μὲν δὲ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ Πτολεμαῖος Ἰσίδωρος, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἑπικλησθεὶς ἑῷ πατρί Φιλομήτορα καλεῖσθαι, καὶ Φινιάδην ἐπὶ τῶν, τὸν δὲ τῷ Ἀλέξ. τὸ πινεῖν, παρὰ δὲ τὸν Ῥοδίων τὸ ὄνομα. Paus. *Atticis*.

ONIS, and under that notion built temples, and consecrated altars to them. Nor did they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop unto their baser flattery, calling those men their† SAVIOURS, for whom they seem'd to have as great respect and honour as for their gods.

Nor does it alwayes signifie ſo much as that it may not be attributed to man: for even in the Scriptures the Judges of Iſrael were called no leſſe then their *Saviours*. *When the children of Iſrael cried unto the Lord, the Lord raiſed up a deliverer to the children of Iſrael, who delivered them, even Othniel the ſon of Kenaz.* And again, *when they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raiſed them up a deliverer, Ehud the ſon of Gera.* Wherethough in our tranſlation we call Othniel and Ehud *deliverers*, yet in the Original they are plainly termed † *Saviours*.

Now what the full import and ultimate sense of the Title of *Saviour* might be, seemed not easie to the ancients: and the * best of the

Which name first given him by the Rhodians • was no way expressed in his usage of the Syrians, As is observed by Iosephus, αἱ τοὶ τοῖς Συρίαις ἀποκαταστάσαντες τὸν Πτολεμαίου τὸν Ἀδρια Σωτῆρα τοῦτο χρηματίσας τὸν θεῶντα παθεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ ἑθνησμοῦ. This was so familiar, that Tertul. useth the Title instead of the name. Post eum (sc. Alexandrum) regnavit illic in Alexandria Soter annis 35. Thus Antigonus was first called by the Greeks their Eupsotēs, or benefactor, then Σωτῆρ, or Saviour, ὁ ἄριστος ἐκείνῳ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν καλεῖσθαι Eupsotēs, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωτὴρ αὐτοῦ, Σωτῆρ. Polyb. l. 5. Thus we read of Demetrius who restored the Athenians to their liberty. ἀναστρέψας, καὶ σωτὴρ αὐτοῖς ἐλθὼν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀμάρτανος, Σωτῆρ καὶ Eupsotēs ἀναγορεύοντες, Plat. in vita. And not only so, but numbred Demetrium and Antigonum among their Dii Soteres; and instead of their annual Archon, whose name they used in their distinction of years, they created a Priest of these Dii Soteres, as the same Anthony testifieth, ἡμεῖς δὲ Σωτῆρας ἀνέστημεν. Ibid. καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τὸν μῆνα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀρχιερεῖς καλεῖσθαι, ἡμεῖς Σωτῆρας ἡμετέροισιν καὶ ἱεραὶς οὐκ αὐτοῖς. Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Babylonians. Τίμαρχος ἱπποκρίτου ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τὸν ἡμέτερον, ἰσ' αὐτῶν Σωτῆρ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ τῷ βασιλευσμένῳ ἀνὸρ φασί. De Bell. Syriac. Lucian's mistake in his Salvation tells us of Ἀρρίωνος ὁ Σωτῆρ, and Appian gives us the routing of the Gauls as the cause of that title: ὁ καὶ Σωτῆρ ἰταλικῶν λαῶν αὐτὸς ὅς τις Ἑυρωπῆς ἐστὶν ὁ Λαῖος ἡμετέροισιν ἐξελθὼς. Ibid. And in proceſſe of time this title grew so customary and familiar, that the Sicilians bestowed it upon Verres their oppressor. Itaque illum non solum Patronum illius insulae, sed etiam Sotera inscriptum vidi Syraculis; says Cicero, Verrin. 2. c. Iud. 3. 9. 3. 15. † Heb. וְיִשְׁעָם וְיִשְׁמָרָא לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִרְדּוּ בְּיָמֵינוּ So the LXX clearly. καὶ ἡμεῖς σωτῆρ Σωτῆρας τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ σωτὴρ οὐκ αὐτοῖς, τὸν Γεδονοῦν μὲν Καὶ Καὶ Qui fuscitavit eis Salvatorem & liberavit eos. Othoniel. Again, καὶ ἡμεῖς σωτῆρ ἀνέστη Σωτῆρας τὸν Ἀδὲν μὲν Ἰσραὴλ. Qui fuscitavit eis Salvatore vocabulo Aioth filium Gera. Per. Test. Upon which place S. Aug. notes, Animadverendum est autem quod Salvatorem dicat etiam hominem, per quem Deus salvos faciat. Quasi. l. 7. c. 18. * So Cicero in the place before recited, having said he saw Verres inscribed Sotera, goes on, Hoc quantum est: ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit. But though in Cicero's time there was no Latine word used in that sense: yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the Greek inscriptions we read often Dedications αὐτῷ Σωτῆρι: so in the Latine we find often Jovi Servatori, or Conservatori, sometimes Jovi Salvatori or Salutori. All which are nothing else but the Latine expressions of the Greek inscriptions. And without question Σωτῆρ might have been rendered Sospirator, and even Sospes as it was used in the dayes of Ennius. Sospes, salvus: Ennius tamen sospitem pro servatore posuit. Festus. Neither indeed could the Sicilians mean any more of Verres, by the word Sotera, then Tully spake of himself, when he stil'd himself Servatore reipub. At least Tacitus did conceive that Conservator is as much as Soter, when speaking of Milichus, who detested the conspiracies to Nero; he saith, Milichus præmiis ditatus Conservatoris sibi nomen, Graco ejus rei vocabulo assumpsit. Annal. l. 15. He took to himself the name of Conservator, in a Greek word which signifies so much, and without question that must be Σωτῆρ. However, the first Christians of the Latine Church were some time in doubt what word to use, as the constant interpretation of Σωτῆρ, so frequent and essential to Christianity. Terrallian useth saluficator, or, as some books read it, salvificator. Ergo jam non unus Deus, nec unus Saluficator, si duo salutis artifices, & utique alter altero indigens. de Carne Christi, c. 14. and shews it was so translated in the Philippians 3. 20. Et quidem de terra in cœlum, ubi nostrum municipium Philippienses quoque ab Apoktolo discunt; unde & Saluficatorum nostrum expectamus Jesum Christum. de Resur. Carnis, c. 47. S. Hilary thought Salutaris a sufficient interpretation. Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quo Iesus nuncupatur. Iesus enim secundum Hebraicam linguam Salutaris est. in Pf. i. 18. S. Aug.

indifferent between that and Salvator: Deus salvos faciendi Dominus est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris, and so Lactant. At last they generally used the word Salvator. First Tertullian, Christus in illo significabatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem; aliis ferus, ut iudex, aliis mansuetus, ut Salvator, adv. Marcion l. 3. 18. Which word of his was rather followed by his imitator S. Cyprian, after whom Arnobius used it, after him his disciple Lactantius; and from thence it continued the constant language of the Church, till the late innovators thrust it out of the Latine Translation.

Latines thought the Greek word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the Latine tongue had no single word able to expresse it.

But whatsoever notion the Heathen had of their Gods or men, which they stiled *Saviours*, we know this name belongeth unto Christ in a more sublime, and peculiar manner. *Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.* Act. 4. 12.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how, and for what reasons Christ truly is, and properly is call'd, our *Saviour*. First then, I conceive one sufficient cause of that appellation to consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the onely true way for the obtaining eternal salvation, and by such patefaction can deserve no lesse then the name of *Saviour*. For if those Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel, who received the way of salvation from him which they delivered unto others, may be said to save those Persons which were converted by their preachings; in a far more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. S. Paul *provok'd to emulation them which were his flesh, that he might save some of them;* ^a *and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.* ^b He exhorted Timothy to *take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this, he should both save himself and them that heard him.* ^c And S. James speaks in more general terms. *Brethren, if any of you do erre from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death.* ^d Now if these are so expressly said to save the souls of them which are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with much more reason must Christ be said to save them, whose ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he *which came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.* ^e The Will of God concerning the salvation of man was reveal'd by him. *No man hath seen God at any time: the onely begotten Son, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.* ^f Being then *the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,* ^g being they which preach it at the command of Christ are said to save the souls of such as believe their word, being it was Christ alone *who brought life and immortality to light through the gospel;* ^h therefore he must in a most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged thereby to save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first respect the title of *Saviour*. a Rom. 11. 14.
b 1 Cor. 9. 22.
c 1 Tim. 4. 16.
d 1 Jam. 5. 20.
e Eph. 2. 17.
f 1 John. 1. 18.
g Rom. 1. 16.
h 2 Tim. 1. 10.

Secondly, this *Jesus* hath not only revealed, but also procured the way of salvation; not onely delivered it to us, but also wrought it out for us: and so *God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved.* ⁱ We were all concluded under sin, and, being the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternal punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that *without shedding of blood is no remission.* ^k *It was therefore necessary that Christ should appear* i Joh. 3. 17.
k Heb. 9. 22, 23, 26.

Matth. 26. 28. *to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And so he did, for he shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins, as himself professeth in the Sacramental institution: he bare our sins in his own body on the tree; as*
 1 Pet. 2. 24. *S. Peter speaks, and so in him we have redemption through his blood,*
 Col. 1. 14. *even the forgiveness of sins. And if while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us: much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him. Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended him, there was no possible way of salvation, but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the Philistines did concerning David, wherewith should we reconcile our selves unto our Master? we have no other name to answer it but Jesus. For*
 Rom. 5. 8, 9. *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. And as under the Law the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile withal in the holy places; so it pleased the Father through the Son, having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself. And thus it comes to passe, that us, who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death. And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the salvation of our souls. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Furthermore, we were all at first enslav'd by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of Redemption. Now it was the Law of Moses, that if any were able he might redeem himself: but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he which was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him. But this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother, but that Son of man which is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin onely excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he onely could, that he freely did perform. For the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many: and as he came to give, so he gave himself a ransom for all. So that in him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins. For we are bought with a price, for we are redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. He then which hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himself as a ransom to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a far higher right unto the name of Jesus, unto the title of our Saviour.*
 Rom. 5. 10.
 Lev. 25. 49.
 Lev. 25. 48.
 Matth. 20. 28.
 1 Tim. 2. 6.
 Eph. 1. 7.
 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Thirdly, beside the promulging and procuring, there is yet a further act, which is conferring of salvation on us. All which we mentioned before, was wrought by vertue of his death, and his appearance in the Holy of holies: but we must still believe, he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For now being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in heaven and earth; and the end

Heb. 8. 25.

end of this power which he hath received is to conferre salvation upon those which believe in him. For the Father gave the Son *this* John 17. 2. power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him; that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortal to put on immortality: and upon this power we are to expect salvation from him. For we must look for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, who Phil. 3. 20, 21. shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. And unto them that thus look for him shall he appear the second Heb. 9. 28. time without sin unto salvation. Being then we are all to endeavour that our spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, being S. Peter hath taught us, that God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a 1 Cor. 5. 5. Prince and a Saviour, being the conferring of that upon us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered; therefore we must acknowledge that the actual giving of salvation to us, is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title Saviour.

Thus by the vertue of his precious blood Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the Angel of the Lord, *thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save* Matth. 1. 21. his people from their sins; well did Zacharias call him *an horn of salvation*, Luke 1. 69. Simeon the salvation of God, S. Paul the captain and author of eternal salvation, S. Peter a Prince and a Saviour, correspondent to those Judges of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called Saviours. In the Heb. 5. 9, 2, 10 time of their trouble, say the Levites, *when they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them Saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.* Act. 5. 31.

The correspondency of Jesus unto those temporal Saviours will best appear, if we consider it particularly in Josuah, who bare that salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions. For as the son of Sirach saith, *Jesus the son of Nave was valiant in the wars, and was the successor of Moses in propheties, who according to his name was made great* Eccles. 46. 1. for the saving of the elect of God. Although therefore Moses was truly and really a ruler and deliverer, which is the same with Saviour, although the rest of the Judges were also by their office Rulers and Deliverers, and therefore stiled Saviours, as expressly Othniel and Ehud are; yet Josuah, farre more particularly and exactly then the rest, is represented as a Type of our Jesus, and that typicall singularity manifested in his name. For first, He it was alone of all which passed out of Egypt, who was design'd to lead the children of Israel into Canaan, the land of promise, flowing with milk and hony. Which land as it was a type of the heaven of heavens, the inheritance of the Saints, and eternal joyes flowing from the right hand of God; so is the Person which brought the Israelites into that place of rest a Type of him who onely can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare our mansions for us, and assign them to us; as Josuah divided the land for an inheritance to the tribes. Beside it is further observable, not

Eccles. 46. 1.

Act. 7. 35.

* Hefych.

ῥύσις, σωτήρ, λυτρωτής. and again, Σωτήρ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ λυτρωτής.

† Quantum attinet ad propheticum apparatus, nec geri nec dici aliquid possit insignius, quandoquidem res perducta est usque no-

minis expressionem, S. Aug. contra Faustum, 16. 19. ὁ ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα ἐκεῖνο εἰσηγάγεν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐξ ἧς λέγουσι καὶ ὡς ἐκεῖνο ἐκ κλήρου διέκλεται αὐτὸν τοῖς εἰσινδύσει ματ' αὐτῷ. Ἰδοὺ καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χρῆστος τῆς διαστροφῆς τοῦ λαοῦ ὡς ἐκεῖνο, καὶ διαμεμελεῖ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἰσχύος. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph.

onely what Josuah did, but what Moses could not do. The hand of Moses and Aaron brought them out of Egypt, but left them in the wilderness, and could not seat them in Canaan. Josuah the successor onely could effect that in which Moses failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, then to take Moses for the doctrine deliver'd, or the books written by him, that is, the

* As Luk. 16.

29, 31, 24, 27.

Ioh. 5. 45, 46.

Acts 6. 11.

collated with

the 13. verse.

Acts 15. 21.

21, 21.

2 Cor. 3. 15.

Μωϋσῆς νοῦτον

τὸν νόμον, Ἰη-

σοῦν τὸν ὁμῶνυ-

μον ἐκείνου συ-

τήρα. ὡς περ

πάλιν καὶ τῆς

ἰστορίας Μωϋσῆ

παραλαβὼν τὸν

Ἰησοῦς τὸν λαόν

εἰς τὴν ἰερουσα-

λὴμ ἐκείνην

ἔτι καὶ μετὰ

τὸ πρῶτον πάλιν

ὁ ἡμῶν υἱὸς ὁ

φανεῖς Ἰησοῦς ὁ

ἐκείνος τὸν Ἰησοῦ

ἐκείνον τὸν ἐκ-

σινάην ἡμῶν

ἰσὶν. Theodoret.

in Ios. Proem.

Cum succes-

for Moyfi de-

stinaretur

Aufes filius

Nave, trans-

fertur certe

de pristino

nomine, &

incipit voca-

ri Iesus. Cer-

te, inquis.

Hanc prius

dicimus figuram futuri fuisse. Nam quia Iesus Christus, secundum populum quod sumus nos, nationes in seculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram re-promissionis melle & lacte manantem, id est, in vitæ æternæ possessionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per Moysen, id est, non per legis disciplinam, sed per Iesum, id est, per novæ legis gratiam provenire habebat, circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi præceptis, (petra enim Christus multis modis & figuris prædicatus est;) ideo is vir qui in huius Sacramenti imagine parabatur, etiam nominis Dominici inauguratus est figura, ut Iesus nominaretur. Tertul. adv. Iudeos, c. 9. & adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 16. Idcirco Moyfi etiam successit, ut ostenderet novam legem per Iesum Christum datam, veteri legi successuram, quæ data per Moysen fuit. Lañ. de Vera Sup. l. 4. c. 17. In cuius comparatione (Moyses) improbatum est, ut non ipse introduceret populum in terram promissionis; ne videlicet lex per Moysen, non ad salvandum sed ad convincendum peccatorem data, in regnum coelorum introducere putaretur, sed gratia & veritas per Iesum Christum facta. S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 16. c. 19. Iesus dux qui populum educeretur de Ægypto, Iesus qui interpretatur Salvator, Mose mortuo & sepulto in Moab, hoc est, Lege mortua, in Evangelium cupit inducere populum suum. S. Hieron. in Psal. 86. a. Act. 13. 39. b. Luke 16. 16. c. Rom. 3. 20, 21, 22. * Exod. 24. 13. † Moyses in nubem intravit, ut operata & occulta cognosceret, adhærente sibi socio Iesu, quia nemo sine vero Iesu potest incerta sapientiæ & occulta comprehendere. Et ideo in specie Iesu Nave veri Salvatoris significabatur affitura præsentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret. S. Ambros. in Psal. 47. d. Ios. 5. 2.

* Non enim propheta sic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; sed, ad Iesum: ut ostenderet quod non de se loqueretur, sed de Christo, ad quem tum Deus loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Iesus.

Lañ. l. 4. c. 17. e. Rom. 2. 29. f. Col. 2. 11. g. Exod. 24. 13. Ios. 1. 1. h. Rom. 15. 8. i. Iohn 1. 17.

* Law; from whence it followeth, that the death of Moses and the succession of Josuah presignified the continuance of the Law till Jesus came, ^a by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses. ^b The Law and the Prophets were until John; since that the kingdom of God is preached. Moses must die, that Josuah may succeed: ^c by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified (for by the law is the knowledge of sins) but the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe. Moses indeed seems to have taken Josuah with him up into the ^{*} mount; but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for [†] without Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, there is no looking into the secrets of heaven, no, approaching to the presence of God. The command of circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Josuah; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their Successour. ^d For at that time the Lord said unto Josuah, make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time. Which speaketh ^e Jesus to be the true circumciser, the authour of another circumcision, then that of the flesh commanded by the law, ^e even the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter; that which ^f is made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called the circumcision of Christ.

Thus if we look upon Josuah as the ^g minister of Moses, he is even in that a type of Christ, the ^h minister of the circumcision for the truth of God. If we look on him as the successor of Moses, in that he representeth Jesus, in as much as ⁱ the law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. If we look on him as now Judge and Ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action which is not clearly predictive of

our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of * Jordan, where Christ is baptized, and enters upon the publike exercise of his prophetic office. He chuseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our Jesus thence began to chuse his * twelve Apostles, those foundation-stones in the Church of God, whose names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city, the new Jerusalem. It hath been † observed, that the saving Rahab the harlot alive, foretold what Jesus once should speak to the Jews, *Verily I say unto you, that the Publicans and Harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.* ^c He said in the sight of Israel, *Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day.* Which great miracle was not onely wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also signify that in the later dayes, toward the setting of the Sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darknesse, the Sun of righteousness should arise with healing in his wings, and giving a check to the approaching night, become *a the true light which lightneth every man that cometh into the world.*

But to passe by more particulars, Josuah smote the Amalekites, and subdued the Canaanites; by the first making way to enter the land, by the second giving possession of it. And Jesus our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, in a spiritual manner, goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to heaven; destroying the last enemy, death, so giving us possession of eternal life. Thus do we believe the man called Jesus, to have fulfilled in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world, whom God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, That we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article is not onely certain, but evident: because there is no end of faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be saved, and no way to be saved by him, but by believing in him. For *this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.* From him then, and from him alone must we expect salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely, there is nothing in our selves which can effect it, or deserve it for us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us. For *there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* 'Tis onely the beloved Son in whom God is well pleased; he is clothed with a vesture dypt in blood; he hath trod the wine-press alone: ^h we like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. ⁱ By him God hath reconciled all things to himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.

luminis coincidentis & jam vergentis in tenebras virtute divina differrer occasum, lucem redderet, invehret claritatem. S. Ambros. Apolog. David. post. c. 4. Ille imperavit soli ut staret, & stetit, & istius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabat, sed Dominus efficiebat. S. Hier. in Psal. 76. d. Ioh. 1. 9. * Τι λέγει πάλιν Μωσής τῷ Ἰσὺ τῷ τῷ Ναυὶ υἱῷ, ὁποῦντος αὐτοῦ αὐτὸ ὄνομα ὅταν σπερματῇ. ἵνα μόνον ἀκούσῃ πᾶς λαὸς, ὅτι πᾶσι αὐτῷ πανταφανεῖσθαι αὐτῷ αὐτῷ Ἰσὺ υἱῷ Ναυὶ * καὶ ὁποῦντος αὐτοῦ ὄνομα ὅποτε ἵσταται καὶ ἀσκαποῖ τῷ γῆνι, καὶ εἰς ἐκείνους εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ γονάτων αὐτῶν κλίνει. ὅτι ἐὰν μετὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν πᾶσι αὐτῷ τῷ Ἀμάλικα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Δαὶ ἐπ' ἐξέστην τῷ μισθῷ Οἱ (ἰσ. ἰδὲ) πάλιν Ἰσὺς υἱὸς οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπου ἀλλ' ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Δαὶ, πάντα ἃ ἐν (αἰσ) φανεῖσθαι. Barnabe Epist. c. 9. c. Luke 1. 69, 71. f. I Ioh. 3. 23, 24. g. I Tim. 2. 5. h. Isa. 56. 6. i. Colof. 1. 20.

* τὸν ὃν ἱερεῖν αὐτοῦ ὁ τῷ Ναυὶ Ἰσὺς ἐστὶν ἀποκαλῶν. ἀρξάμενος γὰρ ἀρχεῖν τῷ λαῷ ἡρῶντο δὸν τῷ Ἰσὺ δαῖνα. ὁ δὲ Χρῆστος βαπτισθεὶς ἡρῶντο ἰσχυροῦς ἰσχυροῦς. S. Cyril. Catech. 10.

* S. Cyril addeth that he divided the land by twelve men. διὰ τῶν δὲ διατεταγμένων τῶν κληρονομήσας καὶ διέμενον τῷ τῷ Ναυὶ υἱῷ, καὶ διὰ τῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων κληρονομήσας τῶν ἀλλοθιῶν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διδοσκέμεν ὁ Ἰσὺς. Ib.

a Rev. 21. 14. † by the same S. Cyril.

πιστεύουσιν ἡμεῖς τὴν πύλιν ἵσταται ὁ τυπικός ὁ ὃς ἀλλοθις φησιν, ἰδὲ οἱ τολώντες αἱ πόλεις σπείρειται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Δαὶ.

b Mat. 21. 31. c Ios. 10. 12, 13.

¶ Stetit Sol, quia in Iesu & typum futuri agnoscebat & nomen. Neque enim in sua virtute Iesu Nave, sed in Christi mysterio coelestibus humanibus imperabat. Designabatur enim Dei filium in hoc seculum esse venturum, qui mundani

By him alone is our salvation wrought : for his sake then onely can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

Secondly, this Belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoyce in the name of *Jesus*, as that in which all our happinesse is involv'd. At his nativity an Angel from heaven thus taught the shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed incarnation ; Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And what the Angel delivered at present, that the Prophet *Isaiah*, that old Evangelist, foretold at distance. When the people which walked in darknesse should see a great light, when unto us a child should be born, unto us a son should be given ; then should they joy before God, according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoyce when they divide the spoil. When God shall come with recompense, when he shall come and save us ; then the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Sion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads.

Thirdly, the belief in *Jesus* ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, ingaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so far as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equal share of affection with him. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me ; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me, saith our Saviour ; so forbidding all prelation of any natural affection ; because our spiritual union is far beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love onely debar'd us, but any equall pretension is as much forbidden. If any man come to me, saith the same Christ, and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. Is it not this *Jesus*, in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expresseible by the pen of man ? God so loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son. Is it not he, who shew'd his own love unto us, far beyond all possibility of parallel ? for greater love hath no man then this, that a man lay down his life for his friends ; but while we were yet sinners, that is, enemies, Christ died for us ; and so became our *Jesus*. Shall thus the Father shew his love in his Son, shall thus the Son shew his love in himself, and shall we no way study a requital ? or is there any proper return of love but love ? The voice of the Church, in the language of Solomon is, my love : nor was that onely the expression of a spouse, but of *Ignatius*, a man, after the Apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot chuse but conclude with S. Paul, If any man love not the Lord *Jesus Christ*, let him be Anathema. Maran atha.

Lastly, the confession of faith in *Jesus* is necessary to breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, and an absolute obedience to him. That we may be raised to the true temper of S. Paul, who counted all things but losse for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ *Jesus* our Lord, for whom he suffered the losse of all things, and counted them but dung that he might win Christ. Nor can we pretend to any true love of *Jesus*, except we be sensible of the readinesse of our obedience to him : as knowing what language he used to his disciples, If ye love me, keep my commandments ; and what the Apostle of his bosome spake, This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments. His own disciples once marvelled,

velled, and said, *What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?* How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, *What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him, whom the senselesse creatures, the winds and the sea obeyed?* Was the name of *Jesus* at first sufficient to cast out devils; and shall man be more refractory then they? Shall the exorcist say to the evil spirit, *I adjure thee by the name of Jesus*, and the devil give place? Shall an Apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name which signifieth nothing unto them; for he took not on him the nature of Angels, and so is not their Saviour; and can we deny obedience unto him, who took on him the seed of Abraham, and became obedient to death, even the death of the crosse for us, that he might be raised to full power, and absolute dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of *Jesus* every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.

Having thus declared the Original of the name *Jesus*, the means and wayes by which he which bare it, expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he saies, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus*, which may be not unfitly in this manner described. I believe not onely that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and professe that I am fully persuaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an Angel was called *Jesus*, of whom particularly Josuah the first of that name, and all the rest of the Judges and Saviours of Israel were but types. I believe that *Jesus*, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the onely way for the salvation of their souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the vertue of his blood; obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually conferre the same salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those which unfeignedly and stedfastly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beside that which he hath shewn us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person which shall conferre it on us but himself. And with this full acknowledgement, *I believe in Jesus*.

And in JESUS CHRIST.

HAVING thus explained the proper Name of our Saviour, *Jesus*, we come unto that Title of his Office usually joyned with his Name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined, because the Jews, who alwayes acknowledged him to be *Jesus*, ever denied him to be *Christ*, and agreed together, that if any man did confesse that he was *Christ*, he should be put out of the Synagogue.

For the full explication of this Title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the words; secondly, to shew upon what grounds

Mat. 8. 27.

Mark 9. 38.

Luke 9. 49.

Acts 19. 15.

Philip. 2. 8.

Phil. 2. 9. 10.

† Ἰησοῦς χριστός
καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ
ἐκείνου ὀμνῶμεν
καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν
ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ ἐστιν.
S. Cyril. Ca-
tech. 10.
a John 9. 22.

grounds the Jews alwayes expected a *Christ* or *Messias*; thirdly, to prove that the *Messias* promised to the Jews is already comes; fourthly, to demonstrate that our *Jesus* is that *Messias*; and fifthly, to declare in what that *Unction*, by which *Jesus* is *Christ*, doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that *Jesus* is *Christ*.

For the first, we find in the Scriptures two several names, *Messias* and *Christ*, but both of the same signification; as appeareth by the speech of the woman of Samaria, *I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ*; and more plainly by what Andrew spake unto his brother Simon, *We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ*, *Messias* in the Hebrew tongue, *Christ* in the * Greek. † *Messias*,

John 4. 25.

John 1. 41.

* Συμψρον, Μα-
ριαν Κορον διε-
μαρ, δε Ουκ ε-
ννε Χριστος: Ιουδαϊσμι δαδωται * Εμμεδς φωνη. Nonnus. † From משיח unxit in the Hebrew, משיח & משיח unctus,

in the Syriac משיח, in the Greek, by changing ψ into ω, by omitting η a natural not fit for their pronunciation, and by adding ε as their ordinary termination, משיח is turned into Μωσιχας. That this was the Greek Χριστος and the Latine Christus, is evident; and yet the Latines living at a distance, strangers to the customs of the Jews, and the doctrine of the Christians, mistook this name, and called him Chrestus, from the Greek χρεστος. So Suetonius in the life of Claudius, c. 25. Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. Which was not only his mistake, but generally the Romans at first as they named him Chrestus, so they called us Chrestiani. Tertul. adv. Genes. Sed & cum perperam Chrestianus pronunciatur à vobis (nam nec nominis certa est noticia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Laërt. l. 4. c. 17. Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere. Upon which mistake Iustine Martyr justifies the Christians of his time, ἡμῶν τὸν κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἡμῶν ἐνέμαλθε, χρεστος παρὰ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. And again, Χρεστανδ (or rather Χρηστανδ) γὰρ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν, τὸ δὲ χρεστος ἡμετέρας εἰ δικάζον. Apol. 2. It was then the ignorance of the Jewish affairs which caused the Romans to name our Saviour Chrestus; and the true title is certainly Christus: Χρεστος ἄρα, κατὰ τὸ κατὰ τὸν, saith Iustine. τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὸν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Μαρία τῆς Χριστοῦ εὐαγγελιστῆς, saies Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 4. c. 15. Quoniam Græci veteres χρεστανδ dicebant ungi, quod nunc ἀλειψανδ, ob hanc rationem nos eum christum nuncupamus, id est, unctum, qui Hebraice Messias dicitur. Laërt. l. 4. c. 7 So the Latines generally Christus à chrismate: and without question χρεστος is from αἰ χρεσται. Yet I conceive the first signification of this word among the Greeks hath not been hitherto sufficiently discovered. The first of the ancients in whom I meet with the word χρεστος is Æschylus the Tragædian, and in him I find it had another sense then now we take it in; for in his language that is not χρεστος which is anointed, but that with which it is anointed; so that it significeth not the subject of unction, but the ointment as diffused in the subject. The place is this in his Prometheus Vinctus.

Οὐκ εἴν' ἀλὲν μ' ἰδὲν, ἰδὲ βράστιον,
Οὐ χρεστον, ἰδὲ πτόν, ἀλλὰ φάρμακον
Χρῆς κατὰ κλινόν.

Prometheus shews himself to be the inventor of the art of Physick, that before him therefore there was no medicine, neither to be taken internally by eating or by drinking, nor externally by way of inunction, as the Scholiast very well expounds it. εἰς τὸ ἰδὲν βράστιον διεσπείρας, ἰδὲ διὰ βράστιον αὐτοσπείρας, (which is ἰδὲ βράστιον in Æschylus) εἰς τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρεστος (which is ἰδὲ χρεστος) ἰδὲ διὰ πτόντος (αὐτὸ δὲ πτόντος τὸ πτόν). So Emstathius Τρεῖς φάρμακον ἰδὲ παρ' Ὀμήρου. ὁμιλῶντες δὲ καὶ τὴν Μηνάδα ἀπὸ τῆς φάρμακα εἰδὲς πτόντος ὁ Μάχων. ὁ χρεστος, οἷον, ἰδὲ χρεστος, καὶ αὐτὸ κατὰ τὸν Ἀλκίον, τῆς τῆς, πτόντος ὁ πτόντος. Ad ll. 6. As therefore from πτόντος πτόντος, so from χρεστος χρεστος, χρεστος. And as αὐτὸν is not that which receiveth drink, but that drink which is received, not quod potat, but quod potabile est; so χρεστος is not that which receiveth oyl, but that which is received by inunction. So the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, Τῶν φάρμακων τὰ μὲν εἰς κατὰσπαστά, τὰ δὲ χρεστά, τὰ δὲ αὐτά. and the Scholiast of Theocritus, Ἰσὶν ὅτι τὸ φάρμακον τὰ μὲν εἰς χρεστά, ὅγαν, ἀπὸ χρεστώδα εἰς διεσπείρας τὰ δὲ αὐτά, ὅγαν, ἀπὸ πτόντος. τὰ δὲ ὁμιλῶντες, ὅγαν, ἀπὸ ὁμιλῶντος. Idyl. 11. So that χρεστος in his judgement is the same with ἰδὲ χρεστος in Theocritus.

Οὐδὲν πτόντος ἰδὲ πτόντος φάρμακον ἀλλο,
Νάδα, δὲ ἰδὲ χρεστος, ἰδὲ πτόντος, ὅγαν, ἀπὸ ὁμιλῶντος
Ἦ τὰ Πτόντος.

In the same sense with Æschylus did Euripides use χρεστος φάρμακον in Hippolyto, Πτόντος δὲ χρεστος ἰδὲ πτόντος τὰ φάρμακον; and not only those ancient Poets, but even the later Orator: as Dion Chrysostomus. πτόντος γὰρ χρεστος καὶ διεσπείρας καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ πτόντος. καὶ αὐτὸν, ἰδὲ πτόντος φάρμακον χρεστος ἰδὲ πτόντος. Orat. 78. and the LXX have used it in this sense; as when the Hebrew speaks of ἰδὲ πτόντος πτόντος oleum unctionis, they translate it τὸ πτόντος πτόντος ἰδὲ πτόντος κατὰ τὸν ἰδὲ πτόντος χρεστος, Levit. 21. 10. and again vers. 12. πτόντος πτόντος ἰδὲ πτόντος τὰ χρεστος ἰδὲ αὐτὸν. Oleum unctionis then is ἰδὲ πτόντος χρεστος, which in Exodus 29. 7. 35. 13. 40. 9. the same Translatours correspondent to the Hebrew phrase call ἰδὲ πτόντος χρεστος, and more frequently ἰδὲ πτόντος χρεστος. But although it appear from hence that the first use of the word χρεστος among the

the Greeks was to signify the act or matter used inunction, not the subject or person anointed; yet in the vulgar acception of the LXX it was most constantly received for the person anointed, of the same validity with $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ or $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Suidas, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota$ $\iota\delta\alpha\iota$) as also with $\iota\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$. For though Lactantius in the place fore-cited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew מָשִׁחַ , unde in quibusdam Græcis scripturis, quæ male de Hebraicis interpretatæ sunt, $\iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, id est, unguentur curatus, scriptum invenitur, $\text{ὁ } \tau\acute{o} \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, yet the LXX have so translated it, Num. 3. 3. $\text{οἱ } \tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma \text{ } \iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. And although Athenæus hath observed, $\text{ὅτι } \omega\pi\omega\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \iota\delta\epsilon\iota \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no difference, as he himself speaks a little after. $\text{ὅτι } \eta \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma \text{ } \iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\eta\iota$. So Hesych. $\text{ἀλειψαί, } \iota\delta\alpha\iota$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. $\text{Καταρτίω, } \iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. Schol. Hom. $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. O. ζ . And Suidas $\iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. Hence Eustathius. $\text{Ἰστέον } \delta\tau\iota \text{ } \iota\sigma\theta\iota \text{ } \omega\alpha\iota\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\iota\eta \text{ } \mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta \text{ } \tau\epsilon \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\eta\delta\epsilon \text{ } \tau\acute{o} \text{ } \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota$ $\tau\acute{o} \mu\eta\eta \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\iota\sigma\theta\iota \text{ } \tau\acute{o} \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o} \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o} \text{ } \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\iota$. O. ζ . So Eusebius. $\sigma\pi\iota\tau\iota\eta \text{ } \tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\psi\acute{o}\tau\iota \text{ } \mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\iota\delta\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\text{ } \tau\eta \text{ } \epsilon\text{ } \iota\varsigma \text{ } \omega\alpha\iota\varsigma \text{ } \chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \text{ } \tau\acute{o} \text{ } \alpha\theta\eta\iota \text{ } \tau\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ } \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma \text{ } \iota\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. Hist. Eccl. 1. 1. c. 3. $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ then in the vulgar use of the LXX is a person anointed, and in that sense is our Saviour called Christ.

the language of Andrew and the woman of Samaria, who spake in Syriac: *Christ*, the interpretation of S. John, who wrote his Gospel in the Greek, as the most general language in those dayes: and the signification of them both is, *the Anointed*. S. Paul and the rest of the Apostles writing in that language, used the Greek name, which the Latines did retain, calling him constantly *Christus*, and we in English have retained the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word , which is to be understood not simply according to the action onely , but as it involveth the design in the custome of anointing. For in the Law whatsoever was anointed, was thereby set apart , as ordained to some special use or office, and therefore under the notion of unctiōn, we must understand that promotion and ordination. *Jacob poured oyl on the top of a pillar*, and that anointing was the consecration of it. Moses anointed the Tabernacle and all the Vessels , and this anointing was their dedication. Hence *the Priest that is anointed* signifieth in the phrase of Moses the High Priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his unctiōn. When therefore Jesus is call'd the *Messias* or *Christ*, and that so long after the anointing oil had ceased, it signified no lesse then a Person set apart by God, anointed with most sacred oil; advanced to the highest office , of which all those employments under the Law, in the obtaining of which oil was us'd, were but types and shadows. And this may suffice for the signification of the word.

That there was among the Jews an expectation of such a *Christ* to come, is most evident. The woman of Samaria could speak with confidence, *I know that Messiah cometh*. And the unbelieving Jews, who will not acknowledge that he is already come, expect him still, *Thus we find all men musing in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not*. When Jesus taught in the Temple, those which doubted, said, *When Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is*; those which believed, said, *When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles then these which this man hath done?* Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed in Jesus, they all expected a *Christ* to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more they believed he was that *Messiah*. Many of the people said, of a truth this is the Prophet: others said, this is the Christ. As soon as John began to baptize, the Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, *who art thou?* that is, whether he were the *Christ*, or no; as appeareth out of his answer. And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, *I am not the Christ*. For as they asked him after, *What then? art thou Elias?* and he said, *I am not*. Are

Iohn 4.25.

Luc 3.15.

John 7. 27:

31.

40.

41.

John I. 19.

20.

† So Nonnus
hath expres-
sed, what in
the Evangelist
is to be under-
stood. Musti-
dus, ὁ μισθὸς
τοῦ κακοῦ
ποιοῦ, The Co-
mmon, bad Re-
ward;
* Author Se-
pher Ikkarim,
l. 4. c. ult.
Maimon.
Traët. de Re-
gibus. c. II.
a Gen. 21, 12.
b Gal. 3. 16.
Acts 3. 22.

Dan.9: 26.

c Nehem.8. 3.
† Celsus the
Epicurean ac-
knowledgeeth
that both the
Jews and Chris-
tians did con-
fesse that the
Propheets did
foretel a Savi-
our of the
world. Οὐραν
μυστὶς Ἐπευρε-
ῖται ἐν τῇ Ισ-
ταύρῃ καὶ ἀποκα-
λύπτει τοὺς ἀν-
θρώπους· ὁ δὲ
ἐκείνου Σωτήριος
ἀποφασίζεται ἐν
τοῦ Σαββα-
του Πνεύματι.
πάλιν καὶ ἀποκα-
λύπτει τοὺς ἀν-
θρώπους Σωτήρι-
ος· τὰ γὰρ ᾧ αἰὶν
Σπύριον. Orig.
adv. Celsum.
l. 3. and his
Saviour saith
Origon was to
be called πνεύ-
μα ἱεροῦ καὶ σω-
τήριος καὶ ἡμε-
τερος καὶ οὗτος

then that Prophet? and he answered, no: So without question their first demand was, art thou the *Christ*? and he answered, I am not. From whence it clearly appeareth that there was a general expectation among the Jews of a *Messias* to come; nor only so, but it was alwayes counted amongst them an article of their faith, which all were obliged to believe who professed the law of Moses, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the Law and the Prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our enquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation.

It is most certain that the *Messias* was promised by God, both before, and under the Law. God said unto Abram, *a In Isaac shall thy seed be called*, and we know that was a promise of a *Messias* to come, because S. Paul hath taught us, *b Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith unto seeds, as of many, but us of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.* The Lord said unto Moses, *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.* And S. Peter hath sufficiently satisfied us, that this Prophet promised to Moses, is Jesus the Christ. Many are the prophecies which concern him, many promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure; others, though plainer, yet have relation onely to the person, not to the notion or the word *Messias*. Whereforever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where *Messiah* is foretold to be cut off: and yet even there the Greek Translation hath not the *Messiah*, but the *Anction*. It may therefore seem something strange, how to universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* should be spread through the Church of the Jews.

But if we consider that in the space of seventy years of the Babylonish captivity, the ordinary Jews had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language before spoken in Judea, and therefore when the Scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee language which they had lately learned. As when Ezra the Scribe brought the book of the Law of Moses before the Congregation, the Levites are said to have caused the people to understand the Law, because *they read in the book, in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.* Which constant interpretation begat at last a Chaldee Translation of the Old Testament to be read every Sabbath in the Synagogues; And that being not exactly made word for word with the Hebrew, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in together with the Text, the general opinion of the learned Jews. By which means it came to passe that not onely the doctrine, but the name also of the *Messias* was very frequent and familiar with them. Inasmuch that even in the Chaldee Paraphrase now extant, there is expresse mention of the *Messias* in above seventy places, beside that of Daniel. The † Jews then informed by the plain words of Daniel, instructed by a constant interpretation of the Law and the Prophets read in their Synagogues every Sabbath day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own Nation, of the Tribe of Judah, of the Family of David, a *Messias* or a *Christ* to come.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the Time in which this promise was to be fulfilled: which

we shall demonstrate out of the Scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised *Messias* is already come. The prediction of Jacob on his death-bed is clear and pregnant: *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and to him shall the gathering of the people be.* But the sceptre is departed from Judah, neither is there one Law-giver left between his feet: therefore *Shiloh*, that is, the *Messias*, is already come. That the Jewish government hath totally failed, is not without the greatest folly to be denied; and therefore that *Shiloh* is already come, except we should deny the truth of divine predictions, must be granted. There remains then nothing to be proved, but that by *Shiloh* is to be understood the *Messias*; which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient Jews, and from the description immediately added to the name. For * all the old Paraphrasts call him expressly, the *Messias*, and the words which follow, *to him shall the gathering of the people be*, speak no less; as giving an explication of his person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name of *Shiloh*. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto Abraham, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, by which he is deciphered in Isaiah; *a In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious*; and in Micah, *b The mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.* And thus the blessing of Judah is plainly intelligible. *c Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise, thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy fathers children shall bow down before thee.* Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and by virtue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the Tribes, the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee. And that you may understand this blessing is not to expire until it make way for a greater, know that this government shall not fail, until there come a son out of your loynes, who shall be far greater than your self: for whereas your dominion reacheth only over your brethren, and so is confined unto the tribes of Israel; his kingdom shall be universal, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Being then this *Shiloh* is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jews to be the *Messias*; being God had promised by Jacob the government of Israel should not fail until *Shiloh* came: being that government is visibly and undeniably already failed; it followeth inevitably, that the *Messias* is already come.

In the same manner the Prophet Malachy hath given an expresse signification of the coming of the *Messias* while the Temple stood. *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in.* And Haggai yet more clearly; *Thus saith the Lord of hosts, yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts.* It is then most evident from these predictions, that the *Messias* was to come while the second Temple stood. It is as certain that the second Temple is not now standing. Therefore except we contradict the veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the *Messias* is already come. Nothing

Gen. 49. 10.

* For instead of כי יבא שילה Onkelos renders it, עד דיימי משיחא and the Jerusalem Targum, עד דיימי משיחא.

Beside, the Cabalists did generally so interpret it, because שילה according to their computation, make the same number with the letters of משיח and in the Talmud, cod. Sanhedrim Rabbi Johanan asking what was the name of the *Messias*, they of the School of R. Schila answer, שילה his name is *Shiloh*, according to that which is written, until *Shiloh* come.

a Isa. 11. 10.
b Mic. 4. 1.
c Gen. 49. 8.

Mal. 3. 1.

הארץ והאדם והשמים.

Kimchi on the place.

Hag. 2. 6, 7, 9.

can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these prophecies concern not the *Messias*; and yet the ancient Jews confessed they did, and that they do so cannot be denied. For first, those titles, *the Angel of the Covenant*, *the delight of the Israelites*, *the desire of all nations*, are certain and known characters of the *Christ* to come. And secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second Temple should be greater than the glory of the first, without the coming of the *Messias* to it. For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the divine glory were in the first Temple, which were wanting to the second: as the Urim and Thummim, by which the High Priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the Ark of the Covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice; the fire upon the Altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consumed the sacrifice; the divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given as it were to the King and High Priest by anointing with the oil of unction; and lastly, the spirit of Prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetic office were induced. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the tears dropt from those eyes which had beheld the former, (For many of the Priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice.) and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this prophecy, *Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?* Being then the structure of the second Temple was so far inferior to the first, being all those signs of the divine glory were wanting in it, with which the former was adorned, the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, than by the coming of him into it, in whom all those signs of the divine glory were far more eminently contained; and this person alone is the *Messias*. For he was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea even of the God of Israel; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle was revealed; he the true Ark of the Covenant, the only propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us, that we might behold his glory; he who received the Spirit without measure, and from whose fulness we do all receive. In him were all those signs of the divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first Temple, in him they were all more eminently contained than in those: therefore his coming to the second Temple was as the sufficient, so the only means, by which the glory of it could be greater than the glory of the first. If then the *Messias* was to come while the second Temple stood, as appeareth by Gods prediction and promise; if that Temple many ages since hath ceased to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly were before the destruction of it in greater glory than ever the former was; if no such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the *Messias*; then is that *Messias* already come.

Having thus demonstrated out of the premises given to the Jews, that the *Messias* who was so promised unto them must be already come; because those events which were foretold to follow his coming, are already past, we shall proceed unto the next particular, and prove that the man

Jesus

Jesus, in whom we believe, is that *Messias* who was promised. First, it is acknowledged both by the Jew and Gentile, that this *Jesus* was born in Judea, and lived and died there before the Commonwealth of Israel was dispersed, before the second Temple was destroyed, that is, at the very time when the Prophets foretold the *Messias* should come. And there was no other beside him that did with any shew of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as the *Messias*. Therefore we must confesse he was, and onely he could be the *Christ*.

Secondly, all other prophecies belonging to the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus*, whether we look upon the family, the place, or the manner of his birth; neither were they ever fulfilled in any person beside him; he then is, and no other can be the *Messias*. That he was to come out of the Tribe of Judah, and family of David, is every where manifest. * The Jews, which mention *Messias* as a son of Joseph or of Ephraim, do not deny, but rather dignifie the Son of David or of Judah, whom they confesse to be the greater *Christ*. *a* There shall come forth a * rod out of the stemme of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, saith the Prophet *Isaiah*. And again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious*. Now who was it but *Jesus*, of whom the elders spake, *b* Behold the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David? who but he said, *I am the root and off-spring of David, and the bright and morning star*? The Jews did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour. *c* How say the Scribes that *Christ* is the son of David? *d* What think ye of *Christ*? whose son is he? they say unto him, the son of David; and that of the people amazed at the seeing of the blind; and speaking of the dumbe: *e* Is this the son of David? The blind cried out unto him, *Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on us*; and the multitude cried *f* Hosanna to the son of David. The Genealogy of *Jesus* shews his family: the first words of the Gospel are, *g* The book of the generation of *Jesus Christ*, the son of David. The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of his lineage, *h* for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah.

Beside, if we look upon the place where the *Messias* was to be born, we shall find that *Jesus* by a particular act of providence was born there. When *i* Herod gathered all the chief Priests and Scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where *Christ* should be born: and they said unto him, in *Bethlehem* of Judea. The people doubted whether *Jesus* was the *Christ*, because they thought he had been born in Galilee where Joseph and Mary lived; wherefore they said, *k* Shall *Christ* come out of Galilee? hath not the Scripture said, that *Christ* cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of *Bethlehem*, where David was? That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the Scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the Jews, and still preserved in the * Chaldee Paraphrase. For thus it is written in the Prophet, *l* And thou *Bethlehem* in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee shall come a governour that shall rule my people Israel. This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfilled in

A king shall come of the sons of Jesse, and the *Messias* out of his sons sons. So Rabbi Solomon and Kimchi. *b* Rev. 5. 5. 22. 16. *c* Mat. 12. 35. *d* Mat. 22. 42. *e* Mat. 12. 23. *f* Mat. 21. 9. *g* Mat. 1. 1. *h* Heb. 7. 14. *i* Mat. 2. 4. 5. *k* John 7. 41. 42. * Which expressly translate it thus; מלך דודי יצא ממשפחת דוד. Out of thee shall come before me the *Messias*, that he may exercise domination in Israel. So Rabbi Solomon מלך דודי יצא ממשפחת דוד. So Kimchi מלך דודי יצא ממשפחת דוד. *l* Mat. 2. 5. 6.

* The Jews have invented a double *Messias*; to one they attribute all those places which mention his low estate & sufferings, to the other such as speak of his power and glory. The one they stile משיח בן דוד, the other

משיח בן יוסף. The son of Joseph they name also the son of Ephraim, and the son of David the son of Judah, as the Targum Cant. 4. 5. Thy two breasts are like two young roes, רינין כריקין משיח בן דוד ומשיח בן אפרים two are thy redeemers, *Messias* the son of David. and *Messias* the son of Ephraim.

a Is. 11. 1. 10. * Which the Chaldee Paraphrase thus translates,

ויצא מלכא ממשפחת דודי ומשיחא ממשפחת אפרים.

Luk. 2. 4.

Luk. 2. 11.

Isa. 7. 14.

Is. 8. 8.

Mat. 1. 22.

Is. 42. 1. 4.

* ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς,
1 Pet. 5. 4.
ἐπισκοπῆς ἡ
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ13. 20. ἐπισκοπῆς
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ
ἐπισκοπῆς ὁ

25. 1 Pet. 2.

25.

2 Mat. 5. οἱ ἁγιοι.

2 Mat. 7. 29.

Mat. 11. 15.

the birth of *Jesus*, when by the providence of God it was so ordered that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own city. Whereupon Joseph and Mary his espoused wife left Nazareth of Galilee their habitation, and went unto Bethlehem of Judea, the city of David, there to be taxed, *because they were of the house and lineage of David*. And while they were there, as the dayes of the Virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfilled; for there he brought forth her first-born son, and so *unto us was born that day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord*.

But if we adde unto the family, and place, the manner of his birth also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The Prophet Isaiah spake thus unto the house of David; *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel*. What nativity could be more congruous to the greatness of a *Messias*, then that of a Virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him then that of *Immanuel* God with us, whose land Judea is said to be? The *Immanuel* then thus born of a Virgin was without question the true *Messias*. And we know *Jesus* was thus born of the blessed Virgin Mary, *that it might be fulfilled which was thus spoken of the Lord by the Prophet*. Wherefore being all the prophecies concerning the family, place, and manner of the birth of the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus*, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other, it is again from hence apparent that this *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

Thirdly, he which taught what the *Messias* was to teach, did what the *Messias* was to do, suffered what the *Messias* was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a *Messias* could obtain, must be acknowledged of necessity to be the true *Messias*. But all this is manifestly true of *Jesus*. Therefore we must confesse he is the *Christ*. For first, it cannot be denied but the *Messias* was promised as a Prophet and Teacher of the people. So God promised him to Moses; I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee. So Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hoseah have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have further occasion to shew. And not onely so, but as a greater Prophet, and more perfect Doctour, then ever any was which preceded him, more universal then they all. *I have put my spirit upon him*, saith God, *he shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles, and the Isles shall wait for his law*. Now it is as evident that *Jesus* of Nazareth was the most perfect Prophet, the * Prince and Lord of all the Prophets, Doctours, and Pastors, which either preceded or succeeded him. For he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority, not like Moses and the Prophets, saying, *Thus saith the Lord*, but, *I say unto you*: nor like the Interpreters of Moses, for *he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes*: with the greatest perspicuity, not as those before him under types and shadows, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine is frequently called *Light*: with the greatest universality, as preaching that Gospel which is to unite all the Nations of the earth into one Church, that there might be one shepherd and one flock. Whatsoever then that great Prophet the *Messias* was to teach, that *Jesus* taught; and whatsoever works he was to do, those *Jesus* did.

When John the Baptist had heard the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples with this message to him, *Art thou he that should come, or do*

do we look for another? And Jesus returned this answer unto him, shewing the ground of that message, *the works of Christ*, was a sufficient resolution of the question. *sonc's. Go and shew John again these things which ye do hear and see. The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up.* And as Jesus alledged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the *Messiah*; so did those Jews acknowledge it, who said, *When Christ cometh will he do more miracles then these which this man doeth?* And Nicodemus a Ruler among them confessed little lesse: *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.* Great and many were the miracles which Moses and the rest of the Prophets wrought for the ratification of the Law, and the demonstration of Gods constant presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many several persons in the space of above three thousand years, are farre short of those which this one Jesus did perform within the compasse of three years. The ambitious diligence of the Jews hath reckoned up seventy six miracles for Moses, and seventy four for all the rest of the Prophets, and supposing that they were so many, (though indeed they were not) how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable if compar'd with all which he wrought, when S. John testifieth with as great certainty of truth, as height of hyperbole, *that there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, he supposed that even the world it self could not contain the books that should be written.* Nor did our Saviour excell all others in the number of his miracles only, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, receiv'd it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in Jesus, in whom dwelt all the fullnesse of the Godhead bodily, and to whom the father had given to have life in himself. This he sufficiently shewed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise: by working without a word or any intervenient sign; as when the woman which had an issue of blood twelve years touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up by the vertue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lest this example should be single, we find that the men of Genesaret, the people out of all Judea and Jerusalem, and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon, even the whole multitude sought to touch him, for there went vertue out of him, and healed them all. Once indeed Christ seemeth to have pray'd before he raised Lazarus from the grave, but even that was done because of the people which stood by: not that he had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterward to raise himself; but that they might believe the Father had sent him. The immanency and inherency of this power in Jesus is evident in this, that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did conferre it upon his disciples: *Behold I give unto you power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy.* Upon the Apostles; *Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give:* Upon the first believers; *These signes shall follow them that believe, in my name they shall cast out devile.* He that believeth on me, the works

John 7. 31.

John 3. 2.

John 21. 25.

Col. 2. 9.

John 5. 26.

Mark 5. 29.

Matth. 14.

34. 36.

Luk. 6. 17, 19.

John 11. 42.

Luk. 10. 19.

Mat. 10. 8.

Mark 16. 17.

John 14. 12.

γεννηθὲν τὸ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι μὴ οἷς ἐκτίθειται, καὶ ἀβυθὸς, ἐδὲ σαρὰς-δυνάμει ὅτι μακρόν ἐστι· ἔχει δὲ ἡ λείψανον πατρὸς τῶν
 Ἑβραίων ἀναγομένη, &c. and then cites this place, and so returns it as an answer to the arguments of Cel-
 sus, that because he was foretold to be as he was, he must be the Son of God. *μακάριον καὶ πιστὸν ἵνα τὸν ἀναγομένην*
δικαίαν τὴν Ἰσραὴλ ἡν ἱσθὶς, τὸ ὅτι ἀναγομένη ἵσθις τῆς γένεως αὐτοῦ πατρὸς-δυνάμει καὶ ἐδὲ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ. Orig.
contra Celsum, l. 6. In the same sense did S. Cyril take these words of the Prophet; who speaking of that
 place of the Psalmist, speciosus forma patris filius hominum, observes this must be understood of his divinity,
 λέγωντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ πατρὸς τῆς μητρὸς σαρὰς-δυνάμει ὅτι ἐστὶν τοῦ μακρόν· γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ἡ Περσέτης· Ἡσυχίας
 ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. ἐκ εἰδὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐδὲ καλῶς, &c. and again, ἐκ εἰδὸς, πῶς οὐκ ἔστιν τοῦ λίαν ἀκατάστατος. Tertullian
 speaks plainly as to the prophecy, and too freely in his way of expression: Sed carnis terrenæ non mira
 conditio ipsa erat quæ cætera ejus miranda faciebat, cum dicerent, unde huic doctrina hæc & signa ista?
 adeo nec humanæ honestatis corpus fuit, nedum coelestis claritatis. Tacentibus apud nos quoque
 prophetis (Isa. 53. 2.) de ignobili aspectu ejus, ipsæ passiones ipsæque contumeliæ loquuntur. Pas-
 siones quidem humanam carnem, contumeliæ vero inhonestam probavere. An ausus esset aliquis
 ungue summo perfringere corpus novum, sputaminibus contaminare faciem nisi merentem? de Carnæ
 christi, c. 9. And that we may be sure he pointed at that place in Isaiah, he says that Christ was ne aspe-
 ctu quidem honestus: Annuntiavimus enim, inquit, de illo sicut puerulus, sicut radix in terra si-
 stenti, & non est species ejus neque gloria. *Adv. Marcion.* l. 3. c. 17. & *adv. Iudeos*, c. 14. This
 humility of Christ in taking upon him the nature of man without the ordinary ornaments of man, at first ac-
 knowledged, was afterwards denied, as appears by S. Hierome, on the 56. of Isaiah. Inglorius erit inter
 homines aspectus ejus, non quo formæ significat sordiditatem, sed quod in humilitate venerit & pau-
 peritate. And Epist. 140. Absque passionibus crucis universis pulchrior est virgo de virgine, qui non
 ex voluntate Dei, sed ex Deo natus est. Nisi enim habuisset & in vultu quiddam oculisque fide-
 reum, nunquam eum statim secuti fuissent Apostoli, nec qui ad comprehendendum eum venerant cor-
 ruissent. So S. Chrys. interprets the words of Isaiah of his divinity, or humility, or his passion; but those of
 the Psalmist, of his native corporal beauty. *Οὐδὲ γὰρ θαυμαστὸν ἔστι θαυμαστὸν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φαιδρὸν*
ἀπλάστως ἐκείνῃ ἡμῶν χεῖρ, καὶ τὸ ἐκείνῃ δυνάμει ἡμῶν, οἷον καὶ καλῶς παρὰ τὸ εἶδος τὸ ἀνθρώπου. Homil. 28.
 in *Matth.* Afterwards they began to magnify the external beauty of his body, and confined themselves to one
 kind of picture or portraiture, with a zealous pretence of a likeness not to be denied, which 800. years since
 was known by none, every several country having a several Image. Whence came that argument of the
 Iconoclasts by way of Quære, which of those Images was the true. *πότερον ἡ παρὰ Ῥωμαίους, ἡ ἡντιμὲν Ἰουδαίῳ*
φωτὸν, ἡ ἡ παρὰ Ἑλλήνων, ἡ ἡ παρὰ Αἰθιοπίας, ἢ ἡ παρὰ ἀλλοδαπῶν αὐτῶν. And well might none of these be like ano-
 ther, when every nation painted our Saviour in the nearest similitude to the people of their own country.
 Ἐκκεῖται μὲν αὐτοῦ ἑκαστοὶ ὅτι καὶ καὶ τῶν Χριστῶν τοιούτοι, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μάλιστα ἰαυτοῖς ἰοῦνται. Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν
 φῶς τὸ αὐτῶν, καὶ Αἰθιοπῶν ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς. Photius Epist. 63. And the difference of opinions in this kind is
 sufficiently apparent: out of those words in Suidas, Ἰσθὶς ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποι αὐτοῦ ἵσθις ἵσθις, αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶδος καὶ
 ὁμοιότης αὐτοῦ ἵσθις γένεσιν ὅτι τῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς Χεῖρ.

the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what the aspect
 of his outward appearance was, because the Scriptures are silent, we
 cannot now know; and it is enough that we are assured, the state and
 condition of his life was in the eye of the Jews without honour and
 inglorious. For though being in the form of God, he thought it not rob-
 bery to be equal with God; yet he made himself of no reputation, and took
 upon him the form of a servant. For thirty years he lived with his mo-
 ther Mary, and Joseph his reputed father, of a mean profession, and
 was subject to them. When he left his mothers house, and entred on
 his prophetic office, he passed from place to place, sometimes re-
 ceived into a house, other times lodging in the fields; for while the
 foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, the Son of man had not
 where to lay his head. From this low estate of life and condition seem-
 ingly inglorious, arose in the Jews a neglect of his works, and con-
 tempt of his doctrine. ^a Is not this the Carpenters son? nay further,
^b Is not this the Carpenter, the son of Mary? and they were offended at
 him. Thus was it fulfilled in him, he was despised and rejected of men,
 and they esteemed him not.

This contempt of his personage, condition, doctrine and works,
 was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution to a
 cruel and ignominious death. All which if we look upon in the
 grosse, we must acknowledge it fulfilled in him to the highest degree
 imaginable, that he was ^c a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. Tryph.
 But if we compare the particular predictions with the historical pas-
 sages

Phil. 2. 6, 7.

Luke 2. 51.

Matth. 8. 20.

a Matth. 13. 55.

b Mar. 6. 3.

c Tryph.

Dial. cum

Tryph.

c Isa. 53. 3.

sages of his sufferings, if we joyn the Prophets and Evangelists together, it will most manifestly appear the *Messias* was to suffer nothing which *Christ* hath not suffered. If Zachary say, *they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver*; S. Matthew will shew that Judas sold *Jesus* at the same rate: for the chief Priests covenanted with him for *thirty pieces of silver*. If *Isaiah* say that he was wounded, if Zachary, *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, if the Prophet David yet more particularly, *they pierced my hands and my feet*; the Evangelist will shew how he was fastened to the crosse, and *Jesus* himself the print of the nails. If the Psalmist tell us; they should laugh him to scorn, and shake their head, saying, *He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him*; S. Matthew will describe the same action, and the same expression: For *they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him*; for he said, *I am the Son of God*. Let David say, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* and the Son of David will shew in whose person the Father spake it, *Eli Eli lama sabachthani*. Let *Isaiah* foretel, *he was numbered with the transgressours*; and you shall finde him crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on his left. Read in the Psalmist, *In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink*; and you shall finde in the Evangelist, *Jesus, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst: and they took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave it him to drink*. Read further yet, *They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture*; and to fulfil the prediction, the souldiers shall make good the distinction, *who took his garments, and made four parts, to every souldier a part, and also his coat: now the coat was without seam woven from the top throughout: they said therefore among themselves, Let not us rent it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be*. Lastly, let the Prophets teach us, that he shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter, and be cut off out of the land of the living; all the Evangelists will declare how like a lambe he suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that he was cut off. And now may we well conclude, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer*; and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he suffered.

Neither onely in his passion, but after his death all things were fulfilled in *Jesus* which were prophesied concerning the *Messias*. * He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, saith the Prophet of the *Christ* to come: and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was *Jesus*, but laid in the tombe of *Joseph of Arimathea* an honourable counsellour. b After two dayes will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, saith *Hoseah* of the people of *Israel*: in whose language they were the type of *Christ*; and the third day *Jesus* rose from the dead. c The Lord said unto my Lord, saith David, sit thou at my right hand. Now d David is not ascended into the heavens, and consequently cannot be set at the right hand of God, but *Jesus* is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God; and so e all the house of *Israel* might know assuredly that God hath made that same *Jesus*, whom they crucified, both Lord and *Christ*. For, he who taught whatsoever the *Messias*, promised by God, foretold by the Prophets, expected by the people of God, was to teach; he who did all which that *Messias* was by vertue of that office to do; he which suffered all those pains and indignities which that *Messias* was to suffer; he to whom all things happened

ed after his death, the period of his sufferings, which were according to the divine predictions to come to pass; he, I say, must infallibly be the true *Messias*. But *Jesus* alone taught; did, suffered and obtained all these things, as we have shewed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

Fourthly, If it were the proper note and character of the *Messias*, that all nations should come in to serve him; if the doctrine of *Jesus* hath been preached and received in all parts of the world; according to that character so long before delivered; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine revealed by *Jesus* should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been divine; then must this *Jesus* be the *Messias*, and when we have proved these three particulars; we may safely conclude he is the *Christ*.

That all nations were to come in to the *Messias*, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. God speaks to him thus, as to his Son; ^f *Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* ^f *Psal. 2. 8.* It was one greater than Solomon, of whom these words were spoken, ^g *All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him.* ^g *Psal. 72. 11.* ^h *It shall come to passe in the last dayes, saith Isaiah, that the mountain of the Lords house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it.* ^h *Isa. 2. 2.* And again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek.* And in general, all the Prophets were but instruments to deliver the same message, which Malachy concludes, from God. ⁱ *From the rising of the Sun even to the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.* ⁱ *Mal. 1. 11.* Now being the bounds of Judea were settled; being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming of the *Messias*, being this was. it which the Jews so much opposed, as loath to part from their ancient and peculiar priviledge; he which actually wrought this work, must certainly be the *Messias*: and that *Jesus* did it, is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached by *Jesus*, cannot be denied. ^k *For although he were not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; although of those many Israelites which believed on him while he lived, very few were left immediately after his death: yet when the Apostles had received their commission from him to* ^l *go teach all nations, and were* ^m *endued with power from on high, by the plentiful effusion of the holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of* ⁿ *three thousand souls; immediately after we finde* ^o *the number of the men, beside women, was about five thousand; and still* ^p *believers more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.* ^q *Upon the persecution at Jerusalem, they went through the* ^r *regions of Judga, Galilee and Samaria, and so the Gospel spread; infomuch that S. James the Bishop of Jerusalem spake thus unto S. Paul, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands* ^s *(or rather how many myriads, that is, ten thousands,) of the Jews there are which believe.* ^t *Beside, how great was the number of the believing Jews strangers, scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, and the rest of the Roman Provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of S. Peter, S. James, and S. John.* ^u *And yet all these are nothing to the*

the fulness of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile-worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the Law; who had before abandoned their old Idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confesse the Deity which the Jews did worship to be that only true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole Law. Now the Apostles preaching the same God with Moses, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumcision and the rest of the legal ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian faith. For being present at the Synagogues of the Jews, and understanding much of the Law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the Arguments which the Apostles produced out of the Scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Thus many of the *Greeks which came up to worship at Jerusalem, & devout men out of every nation under heaven, not men of Israel, but yet fearing God, did first embrace the Christian faith.* After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen Gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes received the Gospel. How much did Jesus work by one S. Paul to *the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed?* how did he passe from Jerusalem round about through Phoenice, Syria and Arabia, through Asia, Achaia, and Macedonia, even to Illyricum, fully *preaching the Gospel of Christ?* How far did others passe beside S. Paul, that he should speak even of his time, that the Gospel was ** preached to every creature under heaven?* Many were the Nations, innumerable the people which received the faith in the Apostles dayes; and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their ** numbers* equallize half the Roman Empire; And little above two ages after the death of the last Apostle, the Emperours of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres to his laws, that the *Gentiles might come to his light, and Kings to the brightness of his rising*, that *Kings might become the nursing fathers, and Queens the nursing mothers* of the Church.

From hence it came to passe, that according to all the predictions of the Prophets, the one God of Israel, the Maker of heaven and earth; was acknowledged through the world for the onely true God: That the law given to Israel was taken for the true law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease, when they ceased to be a people; except the moral part thereof, which as an universal rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man: That all the Oracles of the Heathen Gods, in all places where Christianity

[John 10. 20.

Acts 2. 5.

▼ Rom. 15. 18.
19.

z Colof. 1. 23.

*Visa est mihi res digna consulatione maxime propter periclitantium numerum. Multi enim omnis gratias, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam vocantur in periculum & vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicus etiam

atque agros superstitionis, illius contagio pervagata est. Plin. Epist. ad Trajanum. Tanta hominum multitudo, pars pena major civitatis cuiusque, in silentio & modestia agimus. Tertul. ad Scapul. c. 3. Si hostes externos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum & copiarum? Plures nimirum Mauri & Marcomanni, ipsique Parthi, vel quantacunque unius tamen loci & suorum finium gentes, quam totius orbis fœderati sumus, & vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. Id. Apolog. cap. 36. Potuimus & inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti finem abruptissemus à vobis, suffudisset, & quæ dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissio civium, imo etiam & ipsa destitutione punisset, proculdubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum, & stuporem quandam quasi mortuæ urbis, quæ sissetis quibus in ea imperassetis. Id. Ibid. And Irenæus, who wrote before Tertullian, and is mentioned by him, speaks of the Christians in his time living in the Court of Rome: Quid autem & hi qui in regali aula sunt fideles, nonne ex eis quæ Cæsaris sunt habent utensilia, & his qui non habeat unusquisque secundum suam virtutem præstat? y Isa. 60. 3. z Isa. 49. 23.

was received, did presently cease, and all the Idols, or the Gods themselves were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of Hosts had spoken concerning those times expressly; *a It shall come to passe in that day, that I will cut off the names of the Idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered, also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to passe out of the land.* a Zach. 13. 2.

Now being this general reception of the Gospel was so anciently, so frequently foretold, being the same was so clearly and universally performed, even this might seem sufficient to perswade that *Jesus* is *Christ*. But lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall further shew, that it is impossible *Jesus* should have been so received for the true *Messias*, had he not been so; or that his doctrine, which teacheth him to be the *Christ*, should be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been such. For whether we look upon the Nature of the Doctrine taught, the Condition of the Teachers of it, or the Manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging *Jesus* for his Son, the doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the Apostles what he had foretold by the Prophets.

As for the Nature of the Doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success: for first, it absolutely condemned all other Religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the Roman, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained Precepts far more ungrateful and troublesome to flesh and blood, and contrariant to the general inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of our selves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the cross. Thirdly, it informed those precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such promises as were as seemingly incredible, and unperceivable. For they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our sense; but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that which then seemed as absolutely impossible, the Resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfilled in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listening to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and in summe, *All that would live godly in Christ Jesus, should suffer persecution.* 2 Tim. 3. 12.

If we look upon the Teachers of this Doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any such success. The first Revealer and Promulger bred in the house of a Carpenter, brought up at the feet of no Professour, despised by the High-priests, the Scribes, and Pharisees, and all the learned in the religion of his nation; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, spit upon, condemned, crucified; betrayed in his life by one disciple, denied by another; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the propagation of the Gospel, in this authour of it, *Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness?* 1 Cor. 1. 23. What in those which followed him, sent by him, and thence called Apostles, men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, by profession low and inglorious? How can we conceive that all the Schools

Schools and Universities of the world should give way to them, and the kingdoms and empires should at last come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed divine, except that *Jesus* whom they testified to be the *Christ*, were truly so?

1 Cor. 2. 4.

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this Doctrine to the world, it will add no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of success. For in their delivery they used no such rhetorical expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumentation, as thereby to persuade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compel, no corporal menaces to affright mankind unto a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words, they nakedly delivered what they had seen and heard, *preaching not with enticing words of mans wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit*. It is not then rationally imaginable, that so many Nations should forsake their own religions, so many ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, onely that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their natural inclinations, and that upon such promises as seemed not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and notwithstanding those predictions, which did assure them upon the receiving of that doctrine to be exposed to all kind of misery: That they should do this upon the Authority of him, who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the persuasion of them who were both illiterate and obscure: That they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force. I say, it is no way imaginable, how this should come to passe, had not the Doctrine of the Gospel which did thus prevail, been certainly divine; had not the light of the word, which thus dispelled the clouds of all former Religions, come from heaven; had not that *Jesus, the authour and finisher of our faith*, been the true *Messias*.

To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the *Messias* was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended: He who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the Prophets foretold of the birth of the *Messias*; He which taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffered all those indignities, received all that glory, which the *Messias* was to teach, do, suffer, and receive; He whose doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the *Messias*; He was certainly the true *Messias*. But we have already sufficiently shewed that all these things are exactly fulfilled in *Jesus*, and in him alone. We must therefore acknowledge and profess that this *Jesus* is the promised *Messias*, that is, the *Christ*.

* In Christi nomine sub-auditur qui unxit, & ipse qui unctus est, & ipsa unctio in qua unctus est.
Iren. l. 3. c. 20.
† οἱ βασιλεῖς πάντες καὶ οἱ χεῖροι ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλεῖς καλεῖσθαι καὶ χεῖροι.
Iust. Mart.
Dial.

Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, *Jesus is the Christ*, and shewed the interpretation of the word *Christ* to be *Anointed*; we find it yet * necessary for the explication of this Article, to enquire what was the end, or immediate effect of his Unction, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

For the first, as the *Messias* was foretold, so was he typified: nor were the actions prescribed under the Law lesse predictive then the words of the Prophets. Nay † whosoever were then anointed, were therefore so, because he was to be anointed. Now it is evident that
among

the end of all the sacrifices for which the temple was erected, as the heir of an eternal priesthood *after the order of Melchizedeck*, and of the throne of David, or an everlasting kingdom. Being then the separation was to cease at the coming of the *Messias*, being that could not cease so long as the Administration of that people stood, being that Administration did consist in those three functions; it followeth that those three were to be united in the person of the *Messias*, who was to make all one, and consequently that the *Christ* was to be Prophet, Priest, and King.

Again, the Redemption or Salvation which the *Messias* was to bring, consisteth in the freeing of a sinner from the state of sin and eternal death into a state of righteousness and eternal life. Now a freedom from sin in respect of the guilt, could not be wrought without a sacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was a necessity of a Priest; a freedom from sin in respect of the dominion, could not be obtained without a revelation of the will of God, and of his wrath against all ungodliness, therefore there was also need of a Prophet; a translation from the state of death into eternal life, is not to be effected without absolute authority and irresistible power, therefore a King was also necessary. The *Messias* then, the Redeemer of Israel, was certainly anointed for that end, that he might become Prophet, Priest, and King. And if we believe him, whom we call *Jesus*, that is, our Saviour and Redeemer, to be *Christ*, we must assert him by his *Unction* sent to perform all these three Offices.

That *Jesus* was anointed to the Prophetical Office, though we need no more to prove it then the prediction of *Isaiah*, *The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; the explication of our Saviour, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears; and the confession of the Synagogue at Nazareth, who all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth: yet, we are furnished with more ample and plentiful demonstrations: for whether we consider his Preparation, his Mission, or his Administration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. To Jeremiah indeed God said, Before thou camest forth out of the wombe, I sanctified thee, I ordained thee a Prophet unto the Nations; and of John the Baptist, He shall be filled with the holy Ghost even from his mothers wombe. And if these became singular Prophets by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must his prophetic preparation be, to whose mother it is said, The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee? If the Levites must be thirty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry; Jesus will not enter upon the publick administration of this office, till he begin to be about thirty years of age. Then doth the Holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape like a Dove upon him: then must a voice come from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased. Never such preparations, never such an Inauguration of a Prophet.*

As for his Mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formal testimony of John the Baptist, and the more virtual testimony of his Miracles. Behold, I will send you *Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadfull day of the Lord*, saith God by Malachy. And John went before him in the spirit of *Elias*, saith another Malachy, even an Angel from heaven.

Isa. 61. 1.

Luke 4. 21, 22.

Jer. 1. 5.

Luke 1. 15.

Luke 1. 35.

Num. 4. 47.

Luke 3. 23.

Mal. 4. 5.

Luke 1. 17.

heaven. This John, or Elias, saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, and bare record that this is the Son of God. The Jews took notice of this testimony, who said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him; and Jesus himself puts them in minde of it, *Te sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth; nay they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable, John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man, were true.* But though the witness of John were thus cogent, yet the testimony of Miracles was far more irrefragable. *I have greater witness than that of John, saith our Saviour; for the works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* Notwithstanding the precedent record of John, Jesus requireth not an absolute assent unto his doctrine without his Miracles: *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.* But upon them he challengeth belief: *But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.* If then Moses, and other Prophets, to whom God gave the power of Miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the divine works which they wrought; much more efficacious to this purpose must the Miracles of Jesus appear, who wrought more wonders than they all. Never therefore was there so manifest a Mission of a Prophet.

Now the Prophetical function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the Doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. And the perfect Administration of this Office must be attributed unto Jesus. *For no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* He gave unto the Apostles the words which his Father gave him: therefore he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The Confirmation of this doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to persuade it, *for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who wrought most powerful and divine works to confirm it, and was thereby known to be a teacher from God; who died a most painful and shameful death to ratify it, witnessing a good profession before Pontius Pilate; which in it self unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raising of himself from death.* The propagation and perpetual succession of this Doctrine must likewise be attributed unto Jesus, as to no temporary or accidental Prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that function. *For the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets: and when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men. For he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* It is then most apparent that Jesus was so far the Christ, as that he was anointed to the Prophetical Office, because his Preparation for that Office was most remarkable, his Mission unto that Office was undeniable, his Administration of that Office was infallible.

Now as Jesus was anointed with the Unction of Elizeus to the Prophetical, so was he also with the Unction of Aaron to the Sacerdotal Office. Not that he was called after the order of Aaron: *For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood; but after a more ancient order, according to the predi-*

Ex. 19. 22.
Ex. 24. 5.

* For the Hebrew *קָדַשׁ* signifying holiness, by all the Targums is rendered *קָדַשׁ* that is, primogeniture, so the Arabic and Persian Translations.

a Heb. 8. 3.

b Heb. 10. 5.

c Heb. 10. 10.

d Eph. 5. 2.

Unus ipse

erat qui offer-

ebat, & quod

offerebat.

S. Aug. U-

num cum il-

lo manebat.

cui offerebat.

unum in se-

fecit pro qui-

bus offere-

bat, unus

ipse erat qui

offerebat, &

quod offere-

bat. Id. de

Trinit.

e Rom. 8. 34.

f Heb. 9. 25.

* Παρεκκλήσιον

ἔχειν ἡμεῖς ἵνα

ἡμεῖς ὡς καὶ ἡ

ἐκκλησία τοῦ πα-

τρὸς καὶ ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

πῶς ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ

ction of the Psalmist, *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.* But though he were of another order, yet whatsoever Aaron did as a Priest was wholly Typical, and consequently to be fulfilled by the *Messias*, as he was a Priest. For the Priesthood did not begin in Aaron, but was translated and conferred upon his family, before his consecration. We read of *the Priests which came near the Lord*; of *young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord*; which without question were no other then the ^a first-born to whom the Priesthood did belong. *Jesus* therefore as the first-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and being anointed unto that Office, performed every function, by way of Oblation, Intercession, and Benediction. ^a Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man *Jesus*, if he be an High priest, have somewhat also to offer. Not that he had any thing beside himself, or that there was any peculiar sacrifice allowed to this Priest; ^b to whom when he cometh into the world, he saith; *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me*; and ^c by the offering of this body of *Jesus Christ* are we sanctified. For he who is our Priest hath ^d given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.

Now when *Jesus* had thus given himself a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entered into the Holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our sin. Nor is he prevalent only in his own oblation once offered, but in his constant intercession. ^e *Who is he that condemneth?* saith the Apostle, *it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* Upon this foundation he buildeth our persuasion, that ^f he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. Nor must we look upon this as a ^a servile or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious intercession, as of him, to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth. Beside these offerings and intercedings, there was something more required of the Priest, and that is blessing. ^e *Aaron* was separated that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for ever. We read of no other sacerdotal Act performed by Melchizedek the Priest of the most High God, but only that of blessing, and that in respect both of God and man: First, ^h he that of blessing, and said, *Blessed be Abram of the most High God, possessed of heaven and earth*; then, *Blessed be the most High God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand.* Now it is observable what the Rabbins have delivered, that at the morning sacrifice, the Priests under the law did bless the people with the solemn form of Benediction, but at the evening sacrifice they blessed them not; to shew that in the evening of the world, the last dayes, which are the dayes of the *Messias*, the benediction of the Law should cease, and the blessing of the *Christ* take place. When *Zachariah* the Priest the father of *John Baptist* the forerunner of our Saviour, ⁱ executed his office before God, in the order of his course, and the whole multitude of the people waited for him, to receive his benediction, he could not speak unto them, for he was dumb; shewing the power of benediction was now passing to another and far greater

Priest,

21, 22.

Priest, even to *Jesus*, whose doctrine in the mount begins with *Blessed*; who when he left his disciples, *lift up his hands, and blessed them.* And yet this function is principally performed after his resurrection, as it is written, *Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities.* It cannot then be denied that *Jesus*, who offered up himself a most perfect sacrifice and oblation for sin, who still maketh continual intercession for us, who was raised from the dead that he might bless us with an everlasting benediction, is a most true and most perfect Priest.

The third Office belonging to the *Messias* was the Regal, as appeareth by the most ancient * tradition of the Jews, and by the expresse predictions of the Prophets. *a Yet have I set my king,* saith the Psalmist, *upon my holy hill of Sion.* *b Unto us a child is born; unto us a Son is given,* and the government shall be upon his shoulder, saith the Prophet *Isaiah*, who calleth him the *Prince of Peace*, shewing the perpetuity of his power, and particularity of his seat. *c Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgement and with justice, from henceforth even for ever.* All which most certainly belongs unto our *Jesus*, by the unerring interpretation of the Angel *Gabriel*, who promised the blessed Virgin that the *Lord God* should give unto her Son *d the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* He acknowledgeth himself this Office, though by a strange and unlikely representation of it, the riding on an ass: but by that it was fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet; *e Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee meek, and sitting on an ass.* He made as strange a confession of it unto Pilate; for when he said unto him, *Art thou a king then?* *Jesus answered, thou sayest that I am a King.* To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. The solemn inauguration into this Office was at his ascension into heaven, and his session at the right hand of God; not but that he was by right a King before, but the full and publick execution was deferred till then, when God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion. Then he whose name is called the word of God, had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, *King of kings, and Lord of lords.*

This Regal office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting, and rewarding of his people; partly in the coercing, condemning, and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a law, by which they walk; by furnishing them with his grace, by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortal bodies; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil; by supporting them in all their afflictions; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus ruleth and protecteth here, he rewardeth hereafter in a most royal manner, making them *Kings and Priests unto God and his father.* On the contrary, he sheweth his Regal Dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporal or spiritual enemies. Temporal, as the Jews and Romans, who joyned together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his Disciples, *There be some standing here which shall not taste*

* For the Chaldee Phrase in the most places where it mentioneth the *Messias*, doth it with the addition of *King*, מלך משיח
a *Psalm* 2. 6.
b *Isaiah* 9. 6.
c 7.
d *Luke* 1. 32, 33.

e *Mat.* 21. 5.

John 18. 37.

Eph. 1. 20, 21.

Rev. 19. 13, 16

Rev. 1. 6.

Mat. 16. 28.

of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom: and in that kingdom he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the Jews by the Roman armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves. But beside these visible enemies, there are other spiritual, those which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his fathers Kingdom, those which refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, *These mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.* Thus Sin, Satan, and Death, being the enemies to his Kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Thus is our Jesus become the Prince of the Kings of the earth; thus is the Lamb acknowledged to be Lord of lords, and King of kings.

Luke 19. 27.

1 Cor. 15. 25.
26.

Rev. 1. 5. 17.
14.

Wherefore seeing we have already shewed that the Prophetical, Sacerdotal, and Regal Offices were to belong unto the promised *Messias*, as the proper end, and immediate effect of his Unction; seeing we have likewise declared how Jesus was anointed to these Offices, and hath, and doth actually perform the same in all the functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the *Christ*, but onely to shew the manner of this Unction, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the Law who were the types of the *Messias*, is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible: God appointed an oyl to be made, and appropriated it to that use: and the pouring that oyl upon the body of any person, was his anointing to that office for which he was designed. But being that oyl so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred years before our Saviours birth, being the custome of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased, being howsoever we never read that Jesus was at all anointed with oyl; it remaineth still worthy our enquiry, how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former unctions; and what it was which answered to that oyl, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

The † Jews tell us, that the anointing oyl was hid in the dayes of Josiah, and that it shall be found and produced again when the *Messias* comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the Kings and High Priests of his dayes. But though the losse of that oyl bespake the destruction of that Nation, yet the *Christ* which was to come needed no such unction for his consecration; there being as great a difference between the Typical and Correspondent Oyl, as between the representing and represented *Christ*. The Prophet David calleth it not by the vulgar name of oyl of unction, but the ^a oyl of gladnesse. For though that place may in the first sense be understood of Solomon, whom when Zadoc the Priest anointed, ^b they blew the Trumpet, and all the people said, God save king Solomon. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoyced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them; though from thence it might be said of him, thy God hath anointed thee

of unction
which Moses made, which was hidden with the ark; and the Kings and High priests shall be anointed with it in those dayes. Abarbanel. Comment. ad 30. Exodi. Now the losse of that oyl, which they call the hiding of it, may well be thought to foretell the period of the Mosaicall Administration, being they confesse that after that they never had any Priests anointed, because they had no power to make the same oyl. So plainly confesseth the same Abarbanel. ^a *Psal.* 45. 5. ^b *1 Kings* 1. 39. 40.

† כימור המשיח
עתי הקורט
ביום היום
להחיות לעם
אוחו שכן המשיח
שעשר משה
שנגנו עם
הארץ וכו' משה
המלכים והכהנים
הגדולים כימי
ההם.

In the dayes
of the Messias
God will re-
store unto his
people the oyl
of unction

המשיח שנגנו יאמר עם שאר הכהנים והקורט והם יאמרו לעשרת
with

with the oyl of gladnesse above thy fellows: yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God, (* therefore God, thy God,) the oyl with which that God is anointed, must in the ultimate and highest sense signifie a far greater gladnesse then that at Solomons coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the Church of God.

† The * Ancients tell us that this oyl is the Divinity it self, and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghost. S. Peter teacheth us *how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.* Now though there can be no question but the Spirit is the oyl, yet there is some doubt, when *Jesus* was anointed with it. For we know the Angel said unto the blessed Virgin, *a The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* From whence it appeareth that from the Conception, or at the Incarnation, *Jesus* was sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest; and so consequently, as S. Peter spake, he was † anointed then with the Holy Ghost and with power. Again, being we read that after he was thirty years of age, the Spirit like a Dove descended and lighted upon him, and he descending in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, said unto them of Nazareth, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*, meaning that of Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel*; hence † hath it been also collected, that his Unction was performed at his Baptisme. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviours Unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. David, the most undoubted type of the Messiah, was anointed at Bethlehem, for there *Samuel took the horn of oyl, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.* Of which unction those words of God must necessarily be understood, *I have found David my servant, with my holy oyl have I anointed him.* And yet he was again anointed at Hebron, first, *over the house of Judah*, then over *all the tribes of Israel.* As therefore David at his first Unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the throne of Israel, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of Saul, and acceptance of the Tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he should

* Duae personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei, & qui unxit intellige. Unde & Aquila elo-him *omni* verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo interpretatur, dicens *mi*, & nos propter intelligentiam Deo posuimus, quod Latina lingua non accipit, ne quis perverse putet Deum dilecti & amantissimi & regis his Patrem nominari.

S. Hieron.

Epist. 104.

Quod sequitur, *Unxit te Deus Deus tuus*, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo: quod satis miror, cur Aquila

non, ut coeperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, his nominans Deum qui supradictum unxit Deum. Id. ib. * So Gregory Naz. expounds the place. *ὁ ἱεροῦ ἱεροῦ ἀνακτόντος παρὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου αὐτοῦ, χειρὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ θεός.* And again, *Χεὶρ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.* (not that his Divinity was anointed, or Christ anointed in respect of his Divinity, but that he was anointed in his humanity by his Divinity.) *Χεὶρ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ θεός.* Orat. 2. de Filio. a Luke 1. 35. † *Χεὶρ δὲ ἱεροῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ.* Germanus Constant. *Χεὶρ δὲ ἱεροῦ καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ θεός.* Titus Boettius. Deus est qui ungit, & Deus qui secundum carnem ungitur Dei filius. Denique quos habet unctionis suae christus nisi in carne participes? Vides igitur quia Deus à Deo unctus, sed in assumptione naturae unctus humanae Dei filius designatur. S. Ambrosius de Fide l. 1. c. 2. Hac omnia carni conveniunt, cum piissimum & gloriosissimum verbum unitum est pro salute cunctorum. Cassiodorus in Psal. 44. † S. Hierome mentioning that place of the Psalm, Quando consortes nominantur, naturam carnis intellige, quia Deus consortes substantiae suae non habet. Et quia erat unctio spiritalis & nequaquam humani corporis (ut fuit in sacerdotibus Judaeorum) idcirco praeter consortibus, id est, ceteris sanctis, unctus esse memoratur. Cujus unctio illo expleta est tempore, quando baptizatus est in Jordane, & Spiritus Sanctus in specie columbae descendit super eum, & mansit in illo. Comment. in Esaiam, c. 61. In illa columba quae super ipsum post baptismum descendit, cum sacramento baptismatis, & veri sacerdotii iura suscepit, fuso videlicet super eum oleo exultationis, de quo Psalmista canit; Unxit te, inquit, Deus, Deus tuus. Petrus Damianus, Opuscul. 6. c. 4. b 1 Sam. 16. 13. c Psal. 89. 20. d 2 Sam. 2. 4. 5. 1; 5.

actually

In respect of the matter, they give two causes why it was oyl, and not any other liquour. First, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The Olive was the first of trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its *fartness wherewith they honour God and man*. Therefore it was fit that those persons which were called to a greater dignity than the rest of the Jews, should be consecrated by oyl, as the best sign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour then to be the Son of God, the *beloved Son*, as Jesus was proclaimed at this unction, by which he was consecrated to such an Office as will obtain him a name far above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oyl continueth uncorrupted longer then any other liquour. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not onely it self, but † other things from corruption. Hence they conclude it fit, their Kings and Priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oyl, the most proper emblem of Eternity. But even by this reason of their own, their unction is ceased, being the succession of their Kings and Priests is long since cut off, and their eternal and eternizing oyl lost long before. And onely that one Jesus who was anointed with the most spiritual oyl, * *continueth for ever*, and therefore hath an *unchangeable Priesthood*, as being made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

Beside they observe, that simple oyl without any mixture was sufficient for the Candlestick, but that which was designed for unction must be compounded with principal spices, which signifie a good name, alwayes to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity, by the most laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was such an admixtion of spices, as in the unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was enabled to offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour. For as *he was full of grace and truth*; so of his fulness have we all received, grace for grace: and as we *have received anointing of him*; so we *are unto God a sweet savour of Christ*.

Again, it was sufficient to anoint the vessels of the Sanctuary in any part, but it was particularly commanded that the oyl should be poured upon the head of the Kings and Priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignitie, and * original of all the members of the body. This was more eminently fulfilled in Jesus, who by his unction, or as Christ, became the head of the Church; nay the *head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joynts and bands having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the encrease of God*.

Lastly, they observe, that though in the Vessels nothing but a single unction was required, yet in the Kings and Priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both unction and Affusion, (as it is written, *He poured of the anointing oyl upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctifie him*;) the first to signifie their separation, the second to assure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear then that our Christ was anointed by Affusion, whether we look upon his conception, *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee*; or his inauguration, *the Spirit descended and lighted upon him*? And thus according unto all particulars required by the Jewes themselves to complet their legal unctions, we have sufficiently shewed that Jesus was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

Wherefore being we have shewn that a *Messias* was to come into the world; being we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions

Judg. 9. 9.

† Unguenta optime servantur in alabastris, odores in oleo. Plin. Hist. l. 13. c. 2.

Existimatur & ebori vindicando a carie utile esse. Certe simulacrum Saturni Romæ intus oleo repletum est. Id. l. 15. c. 7.

And whosoever made that Statue at

Rome, seems to have had his art out of

Greece, from that famous

Ivory Statue made by Phidias. Odr.

ὁ γὰρ μὲν τὸ χρυσὸν καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν Πρωτοῦ ἐκείνου (ἢ ἰσχυροῦ) ἵνα οὐκ ἴσται

ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα, ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ

αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου αὐτοῦ

Proclus apud Epiphani. Har. 64. §. 18.

a Heb. 7. 16.

24.

b John 1. 16.

c 1 John 2. 27.

d 2 Cor. 2. 15.

* According to the Etymology in the Hebrew language, of which Ababanel here takes notice

לְכָן נִקְרָא רֹאשׁ כִּי הוּא רֹאשׁ לְכָל הָאֲנָרִי הַיָּדוּעַ מִלְּפָנָיו.

e Col. 2. 10.

19.

f Lev. 8. 12.

tions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that *Jesus* born in the dayes of Herod, was, and is, that promised *Messias*; being we have further declared, that he was anointed to those Offices which belonged to the *Messias*, and actually did, and doth still perform them all; and that his anointing was by the immediate effusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the Legal and Typical Unction: I cannot see what further can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

The necessity of believing this part of the Article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our *Jesus*, except he were the *Christ*. For he could not reveal the way of Salvation, except he were a Prophet; he could not work out that Salvation revealed, except he were a Priest; he could not conferre that Salvation upon us, except he were a King; he could not be Prophet, Priest, and King, except he were the *Christ*. This was the fundamental doctrine which the Apostles not onely testified, as they did that of the Resurrection, but argued, prov'd, and demonstrated out of the Law
 Acts 17. 2, 3. and the Prophets. We find S. Paul at Thessalonica *three Sabbath-dayes reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you, is Christ*. We find him again at Corinth pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jewes, that *Jesus was Christ*.
 18, 5: Thus Apollos by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, mightily convinced the Jewes, and that publickly shewing by the Scriptures, that *Jesus was Christ*.
 28. This was the touchstone by which all men at first were tried, whether they were Christian or Antichristian. For whosoever believeth, saith S. John, that *Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*. What greater commendation of the assertion of this truth? *Who is a liar, saith the same Apostle, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This man is the Antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son*. What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

Secondly, as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamental truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations, because except it hath so, it cannot clearly be maintain'd. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant, then to pretend to demonstrate a Truth as infallible, & at the same time to shew it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth faith in *Christ* already come, and liveth not according to that profession: for thereby he proveth, as far as he is able, that the true *Christ* is not yet come, at least that *Jesus* is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jewes that our Saviour, who did and suffer'd so much, is the true *Messias*; but by our lives we recall our arguments, and strengthen their wilfull opposition. For there was certainly a Promise, that when *Christ* should come, *the wolf should dwell with the lambe, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the calfe, and the young lion and the sucking together, and a little child should lead them*; that is, there should be so much love, unanimity, and brotherly kindnesse in the Kingdome of *Christ*, that all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas if we look upon our selves, we must confesse there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptomes of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness,

blennesse, then in those which make profession of the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold, that *when the law should go forth out of Zion, Isa. 2. 4.* and the word of the Lord from Ierusalem, they should beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they learn warre any more. Whereas there is no other Art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not onely as lawfull, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendome divided into several Kingdomes and Principalities; what are all these, but so many publick enemies, either exercising or designing warre? The Church was not more famous, or did more encrease by the first blood which was shed in the primitive times, through the external violence of ten persecutions, then now 'tis infamous, and declines through constant violence, fraud and rapine, through publick ingagements of the greatest Empires in armes, through civile and intestine warres, and lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by Massacres. It was likewise prophesied of the dayes of the *Messias*, that all Idolatry should totally cease, that all false teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits restrained. And can we think that the Jews, who really abhorre the thoughts of worshipping an image, can ever be perswaded there is no Idolatry committed in the Christian Church? Or can we excuse our selves in the least degree from the plague of the locusts of Egypt, the false teachers? Can so many schismes and sects arise, and spread? can so many heresies be acknowledged and countenanced, without false Prophets, and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian love & charity, if we would appear true lovers of peace and tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations of Idolatry, false doctrine and heresie, let us often remember what we ever professe in our Creed, that *Jesus is the Christ*, that the Kingdome of the *Messias* cannot consist with these impieties. *Zach. 13. 2.*

Thirdly, the necessity of this Belief appeareth in respect of those Offices which belong to *Jesus*, as he is the *Christ*. We must look upon him as upon the Prophet anointed by God to preach the Gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his doctrine. Though Moses and Elias be together with him in the Mount, yet the voice from heaven speaketh of none but *Jesus*, *hear ye him*. He is that Wisedome the *delight of God*, crying in the Proverbes, *Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates; waiting at the posts of my doors. There is one thing needfull*, saith our Saviour, and *Mary chose that good part, who sate at Jesus feet, and heard his word.* *Matth. 17. 5.* Which devout posture teacheth us as a willingnesse to hear, so a readinesse to obey: and the proper effect which the Belief of this Prophetical Office worketh in us, is our *Obedience of faith*. We must further consider him as our high Priest, that we may thereby adde Confidence to that Obedience. For we have *boldnesse to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Iesus; yea having an High Priest over the house of God; we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.* *Heb. 10. 19, 21, 22, 23.* And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us. For if Christ have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him; if we be *bought with a price*, we are no longer our own; but we must *glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are Gods*. Again, an apprehension of him as a King is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him; *1 Cor. 6. 20.*

which that name first was heard. * *And the Disciples were called Christians first at Antioch*, as the Scriptures assure us; so named by Euodius the Bishop of that place, as Ecclesiasticall History informs us. A name no sooner invented, but embraced by all believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their Profession, and relation to the Authour and Master whom they served. In which the Primitive Christians so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge † no other title but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this name of greater honour to us, then of obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity*. It was a common answer of the ancient Martyrs, *I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done*. The very name was thought to speak something of * emendation; and whosoever put it on, became the better man. Except such reformation accompany our profession, there is no † advantage in the appellation; nor can we be honoured by that title, while we dishonour him that gives it. If he be therefore called *Christ*, because anointed; as we derive the name of *Christian*, so do we receive our † unction from him. For as *the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard and went down to the skirts of his garments*: so the Spirit which without measure was poured upon Christ our head, is by him diffused through all the members of his * body. For *God hath e-*

* S. Luke noteth the place, but neither time when, nor person by whom this name was given. Tertullian seems to make it as ancient as the reign of Tiberius, Apolog. c. 5. Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in sæculum introivit. But I conceive indeed he speaks not of the name, but of the Religion: for so he may well be thought to expound himself, say-

ing soon after, census istius disciplinae, ut jam edidimus, à Tiberio est. c. 7. However, the name of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberius, nor, as I think, as Caius. Some ancient Authour in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when S. Peter had ordained Euodius Bishop of Antioch. Ἰστοῦν δ' ὅτι ἐν τῇ Κλαυδίου βασιλείᾳ Πάππῳ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσαντι Ἐυδοίον, καὶνομένῳ δὲ τὸν λαὸν λατρεύοντι Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι, Χριστιανοί. Suid. in Ναζωραῖοι & in Χριστιανοί. And Iohannes Antiochenus confirms not onely the time, but tells us that Euodius the Bishop was the authour of the name. Καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ (Κλαυδίου) Χριστιανοὶ ἀνομύθησαν, ὅτι αὐτῷ ὀνομάσθη Ἐυδοῖος ἀποστολικῶς αὐτῷ καὶ ὀνομάσθησαν αὐτοὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. πρῶτον γὰρ Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι ἐκαλεῖτο οἱ Χριστιανοί. Thus the name of Christian was first brought into use at Antioch, by Euodius the Bishop of the place, and hath ever since been continued as the most proper appellation which could be given unto our profession, being derived from the authour and finisher of our faith. At nunc Secta oditur in nomine utique sui autoris. Quid novi si aliqua disciplina de Magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne Philosophi de auctoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? Etiam à locis conventiculorum & stationum suarum Stoici, Academici? Neque Medici ab Erasistrato, & Grammatici ab Aristarcho, Coci etiam ab Apicio? Neque tamen quenquam offendit professio nominis cum institutione transmissa ab institutore. Tertull. Apolog. c. 3. † As we read of Sanctus a Deacon at Vienna in a hot persecution of the French Church, who being in the midst of tortures, was troubled with several questions, which the Gentiles usually then asked, to try if they could extort any confession of any wicked actions practised secretly by the Christians, yet would not give any other answer to any question, then that he was a Christian. ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀνταπεκρίσατο αὐτοῖς, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐχρηστέον ὄνομα, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον καὶ τὸ πάλαι ὄν, καὶ ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα, καὶ ἐν τῷ πάλαι καὶ ἐν τῷ ὄντι, καὶ ἐν τῷ πατὴρι ἰππαρχίδι αἰμολόγηται. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1. The same doth S. Chrysostome testify of S. Lucian. πάλαι ἐπὶ παλιν Χριστιανὸς εἰμι φησὶ. τί ἔχει ὀνομασθῆναι; Χριστιανὸς εἰμι. τίνας ποιεῖς; ὁ σὸς ἀπαύλα ἐλάττω, ὅτι Χριστιανὸς εἰμι. 2 Tim. 2. 19. * So Blandina in the French persecution. ἦν αὐτῇ ἀνάκλησις καὶ ἀνάπαυσις καὶ ἀνακρίσις ὑπὸ Συμβασιόντων, τὸ λέγειν ὅτι Χριστιανὴ εἰμι, καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ὁδὸν φαύλων γίνεσθαι. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1. * Alii quos ante hoc nomen vagos, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipso denotant quod laudant, cæcitate odii in suffragium impingunt. Quæ mulier? quam lasciva! quam festiva! qui juvenis? quam lascivus! quam amasius! facti sunt Christiani, ita nomen emendationis imputatur. Tertull. † Totum in id revolvitur, ut qui Christiani nominis opus non agitis, Christianus non esse videatur. Nomen enim sine actu atque officio suo nihil est. Salvian. de Provid. l. 4. Ἐάν τις τὸ ὄνομα λαβὼν τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν ἐνδεδίξῃ τὴν Χριστὸν, ὁδὸν ὁρίσῃ αὐτοῦ ὁδοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας. S. Basil ad Amphilocho. † Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Tertull. Apolog. c. 3. * Inde apparet Christi corpus nos esse, qui omnes unguimur, & omnes in illo & Christi, & Christus sumus, quia quodammodo totus Christus caput & corpus est. S. August. in Psal. 26. a Psal. 133. 2. b 2 Cor. 1. 21.

c 1 Iohn 2. 20, *stablished and anointed us in Christ : c We have an unction from the Holy one, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us.* Necessary then it cannot chuse but be, that we should know *Jesus* to be the *Christ* : because as he is *Jesus*, that is, our Saviour, by being *Christ*, that is, anointed; so we can have no share in him as *Jesus*, except we become truly *Christians*, and so be in him as *Christ*, anointed with that unction from the Holy One.

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explication of the title *Christ*, we may at last clearly expresse, and every Christian easily understand, what it is we say when we make our Confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the Prophets to be the *Messias*, the Redeemer of *Israel*, and the expectation of the Nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the *Messias* so promised is already come. I am as certainly perswaded, that the man born in the dayes of *Herod* of the Virgin *Mary*, by an Angel from heaven called *Jesus*, is that true *Messias*, so long, so often promised : that, as the *Messias*, he was anointed to three especiall offices, belonging to him as the Mediatour between God and man : that he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, & so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King set down at the right hand of God, farre above all principalities and powers, whereby when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will conferre actuall, perfect, and eternal happinesse upon us. I believe this unction by which he became the true *Messias*, was not performed by any materiall oyl, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgement I believe in *Jesus Christ*.

HIS ONLY SON.

After our Saviours Nomination immediately followeth his Filiation : and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be the *Christ*, do we confesse him to be the *Son of God*; because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the Jewes themselves accounted equivalent. Thus *Nathaniel*, that true *Israelite*, maketh his confession of the *Messias*; *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*. Thus *Martha* makes expression of her faith; *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*. Thus the High Priest maketh his inquisition; *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God*. This was the famous Confession of *S. Peter*; *We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God*. And the Gospel of *S. John* was therefore written, that *we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*. Certain then it is that all the Jewes, as they looked for a *Messias* to come, so they believed that *Messias* to be the Son of God : (although since the coming of our Saviour they have * denied it) and that by reason of a constant interpretation of the second Psalm, as appropriated

Iohn 1. 49.

Iohn 11. 27.

Matth. 26. 63.

Iohn 6. 69.

Iohn 20. 31.

* For when Celsus in the person of a Jew had spoken these words

καὶ εἶπεν ἰσχυρῶς ἀποφάναι ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ ποτὶς, ὅτι ἦεν θεὸς υἱός, καὶ ὁ θεὸς υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἀδικῶν κληθεὶς, Origen sayes they were most improperly attributed to a Jew, who did look indeed for a *Messias*, but not for the Son of God. i.e. not under the notion of a Son. Ἰουδαῖος δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἱμαρολόγηται ὅτι ἀποφάναι τις εἶπεν ἦεν θεὸς υἱός· ὁ γὰρ λίγιστον, ἰσχυρῶς ὅτι ἦεν υἱὸς καὶ θεὸς καὶ ποταμὸς ὁ ζῶντων ἀπὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἰουδαῖος ποτὶς υἱὸς θεοῦ, αἰς εὐδαίως δὲ τοῦτο αὐτὸν περὶ τὴν διάνοιαν. Adv. Cels. l. 1.

unto

unto him. And the Primitive Christians did at the very beginning include this filial Title of our Saviour together with his names into the compasse of † one word. Well therefore after we have expressed our faith in *Jesus Christ*, is added that which alwayes had so great affinity with it, the *only Son of God*.

In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the * *only Son*, that in the phrase of the Scripture and the Greek Church, is the *only begotten*. It is then sufficient for the explication of these words, to shew how *Christ* is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his Generation; that when others are also the Sons of God, he alone should so be his Son, as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the *only begotten*.

First then, it cannot be denied that Christ is the *Son of God*, for that reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the Virgin Mary; *for that which is conceived* (or, † *begotten*) *in her*, by the testimony of an Angel, *is of the Holy Ghost*; and because of him; therefore the Son of God. For so spake the Angel to the Virgin; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee* (or, *which is begotten of thee*)

† That is
IXΘΞ. Nos
piscifili se-
cundum ἰ-
xθyς nostrum
Iesum Chri-
stum in aqua
nascimur.
Tertull. de
Bapt. C. I.
which is thus
interpreted by
Optatus, Cu-
ius piscis no-
men seculum
appellationem
Græcam in uno
nomine per
singulas literas
turbam sanctorum
nominum
continet ἰxθyς
quod est Latine,
Iesus

shall be called the Son of God. And the reason is clear, because that the Holy Ghost is God. For were he any Creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the Virgin, he must have been the Son of a Creature, not of God.

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ thus born of the Virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an Office by the special and immediate will of God, that by vertue thereof he must be acknowledged the Son of God. He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews. *Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods? Are not these the very words of the eighty second Psalm? If he called them Gods, if God himself so spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called Gods, unto whom the word of God came, (and the Scripture cannot be broken, nor the authority thereof in any particular denied;) Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary Office, say ye of him, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

Thirdly, Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life. For God hath fulfilled the promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ who is raised from thence, is as it were begotten to another life; and God who raised him is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Thus was he defin'd or constituted, and appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead: neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the first born from the dead.

Fourthly, Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his fathers house, and Lord of all the Spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. He is set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, being made so much better then the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident, that Christ hath this four-fold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviours Filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the Sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the onely-begotten Son. For although to be born of a Virgin be in it self miraculous, and justly entitles Christ unto the Son of God; yet is it not so farre above the production of all man kind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the onely-begotten. We read of Adam the Son of God, as well as Seth the Son of Adam: and surely the framing Christ out of a woman, cannot so farre transcend the making Adam out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance, as we must believe between the first and second Adam. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth, who did believe his doctrine, and did confesse him to be the Son

Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much lesse did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these ways by which Christ is represented to us as the *Son of God*, we shall finde out one more yet, farre more proper in it self, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other Son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confesse him the *Only-begotten*.

To which purpose I observe, that the actuall possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his Office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same *Christ* was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgins wombe. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following Method, as not onely most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will clearly prove out of the holy Scriptures, that *Jesus Christ*, born of the Virgin Mary, had an actuall being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgins wombe, was not any created being, but essentially divine. Thirdly, we will shew that the divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son. Lastly, we will manifest that the divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly the *only-begotten Son of the Father*.

As for the first, that *Jesus Christ* had a reall being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin Mary, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in Heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven or went unto the Father, he had a reall being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these two suppositions not to be denied: first, that what was begotten of the Virgin had its first being here on earth, and therefore could not really be in heaven till it ascended thither: secondly, that what was really in heaven, really was, because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions certainly true the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume. *Jesus Christ* was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven, or went unto the Father; as I shall particularly prove by the expresse words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude, that *Jesus Christ* had a reall being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived

John 6.62.
 διαπίπτει, as it
 came to passe,
 διαπίπτων αὐ-
 τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.
 Acts 1. 9.
 ἔπαινε.

ceived in her. Now that he was really in heaven before he ascended thither, appeareth by his own words to his Disciples. *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as spectators. The place to which that ascension tended, was truly and really the Heaven of heavens. The verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth not a figurative but a real being, especially considering the opposition in the word *before*. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in heaven was *before*. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther shew that this ascension was the first, that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he speaks; and being in heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If Christ had ascended into heaven before his death, and descended from thence, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the Gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the Evangelists ever make mention of it? Those which are so diligent in the description of his nativity and circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by Simeon, his adoration by the wise men; those which have described his descent into Egypt; would they have omitted his ascent into heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he shewed when he disputed with the Doctors; and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent seeking of Joseph and Mary, and her words when they found him, *Son, why hast thou dealt so with us?* shew that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended into heaven. After that he went down to Nazareth, and *was subject to them*: and I understand not how he should ascend into heaven, and at the same time be subject to them, or there receive his Commission and Instructions as the great Legate of God, or Embassadour from heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to John to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his inauguration. Immediately from Jordan he is carried into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil: and 'twere strange if any time could then be found for his Ascension; for *he was forty dayes in the wilderness*, and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time *with the beasts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celestial Hierarchy; and *tempted of Satan*, whose dominion reacheth no higher then the air. Wherefore in those forty dayes Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him, for *the Angels ministered unto him*. After this he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there exercised his propheticall Office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory Ascension of Christ, is not onely raised without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in it self, and contrary to the revealed way of our Redemption. For what reason should

Luke 2. 48.

Mark 1. 13.

Mark 1. 13.
 Luke 4. 14.

should Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this onely asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the Sacerdotal Office. For the Holy of holies *made with hands* was the figure of the true, (that is, *heaven it self*) into which the High Priest alone went once every year: and Christ as our High Priest *entred in once into the holy place*. If then they deny Christ was a Priest, before he preached the Gospel, then did he not enter into heaven, because the High Priest alone went into the type thereof, the Holy of holies. If they confesse he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but *once*, and that not without blood. Wherefore being Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our Argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it; for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself. *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven; and, I am the living bread which came down from heaven*. He opposeth himself unto the Manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven, or had its original from thence. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven: but the Father gave Christ really from thence*. Wherefore he saith, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me*. Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the Angels: but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather when any is opposed to Christ, the opposition is placed in this very origination. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mothers wombe; born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God: and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this; *He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth, he that cometh from heaven is above all*. Adam was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman; and yet he is so far from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second Adam. For *the first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven*. Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and that antecedently to any ascent thither. For *that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first*? So S. Paul asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of Christ as his first motion between heaven and earth; and consequently, that the first being or existence which Christ had, was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven; in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His disciples believed that he *came out from God*, and he commended that faith, and confirmed the object of it by this assertion;

Heb. 9.24.
7.

Ioh. 6.33, 51.

32:

38.

Luke 1.15.

Iohn 3. 31.

1 Cor. 15.47

Eph. 4.9,

I came

John 16. 27. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* Thus having by undoubted testimonies made good the later part of the Argument, I may safely conclude, that being Christ was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any shew of reason be denied, that Christ had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

Secondly, we shall prove not onely a bare priority of existence, but a preexistence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was man. This no man can deny, because all must confesse the blessed Virgin was first saluted by the Angel six moneths after Elizabeth conceived, and many hundred years after Abraham died. But Jesus Christ was really existent before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but Christ had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the expresse testimony of John himself. *This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.* In which words, First, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of Christ, *he that cometh after me*: for so he came after him into the womb, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office at his baptisme; alwayes after John, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, *he is preferred before me*; as appeareth by the reiteration of these words; *He it is who coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes-latchet I am not worthy to unloose.* The addition of which expression of his own unworthinesse, sheweth, that to be preferred before him, is the same with being *worthier then he*, to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three Evangelists. Thirdly, he rendreth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to Christ, saying, *for, or rather, because he was before me.* And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of it self, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it, a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration, (as the very tense, *he was before me*, sufficiently signifieth) and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if John the Baptist had thus spake at large. This man Christ Jesus, who came into the world, and entred on his propheticall Office six moneths after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity then I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge my self unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me.

Now as Christ was before John, which speaks a small, so was he also before Abraham, which speaks a larger time. Jesus himself hath asserted this preexistence to the Jews; *Verily verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* Which words plainly and literally expounded, must

must evidently contain this truth. For first, *Abraham* in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification then such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy spake of the same person. Beside *Abraham* must be the subject of that proposition, *Abraham was*; because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if *Abraham* be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate *Abraham was*, in a tense signifying the time past, so it is most certainly to be understood, because that which he speaks unto is the preexistence of *Abraham*, and that of long duration: so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition, had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression *I am*, seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth: yet the * use of it sufficiently maintaineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. And then the words will plainly signify thus much. Do you question how I could see *Abraham*, who am not yet fifty years old? Verily verily, I say unto you, † Before ever *Abraham*, the person whom you speak of, was born, I had a real being and existence, (by which I was capable of the sight of him) in which I have continued untill now. In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviours answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous, and therefore *they took up stones to cast at him*.

This literal and plain explication is yet further necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of, and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition, of the *light of the world*, which there can be no * shew of reason to admit)

thus the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, *πρότερον ἔγενοντο ἐμοὶ ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, so on the contrary, *ἔτι μὲν ἔγενοντο ἐμοὶ ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. Iohn 7. 33. and *ἔτι ἐμὴν ἡμέραν*, *ἐν αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣν ἐλάλησεν*. Iohn 12. 26. 14. 33. 17. 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (Ioh. 7. 34.) we read *ἔτι ἐμὴν ἡμέραν*, or *ἔτι ἐμὴν*. For Nonnus seems to have read it *ἐμὴν* by his translation, *eis atēpatōn hēmerā idēōw* and the Jews question, *πῶς ἔτι μὲν ἔγενοντο ἐμοὶ ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, shewes they understood it so: for this *ἐμὴν* though of a present form, is of a future signification. Helyc. *Εἰμὶ, ἀποβήσομαι*. And so it agreeth with that which follows, Iohn 8. 21. *ἔτι ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. If we read *ἐμὴν*, as the Old Translation, *ubi ego sum*, it will have the force of *ἔσομαι*, and agree with the others; *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. Howsoever it is clear, S. Iohn useth the present *ἐμὴν* either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our consideration, can admit no other relation but to the time already past in which *Abraham* lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joyned with the Aorist elsewhere: as Psal. 90. 2. *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. What can be more parallel then, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. *Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἔτι ἐμὴν*, and *ἔτι ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. In the same manner, though by another word, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. Prov. 8. 25. † So the Æthiopic Version, *Amen dico vobis, Priusquam Abraham nasceretur, fui ego*; and the Persian, *Verē verē vobis dico, quod nondum Abraham factus erat, cū ego eram*. * This is the shift of the Socinians, who make this speech of Christ elliptical, and then supply it from the 12. verse. I am the light of the world. *Quod verō ea verba, Ego sum, sint ad eum modum supplenda ac si ipse subiecisset iis, Ego sum lux mundi, superius ē principio ejus orationis v. 12, & hinc quod Christus bis seipsum iisdem, Ego sum, lucem mundi vocaverit. v. 24. & 28. deprehendi potest, catech Racov. whereas there is no ground for any such connexion. That discourse of the lights of the world, was in the treasury, v. 20. that which followeth was not, at least appeareth not to be so. Therefore the ellipsis of the 24. and 28. verses is not to be supplied by the 12, but the 24 from the 23. *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, and the 28. either from the same, or that which is most general, his Office, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*. Again v. 31. 'Tis very probable that a new discourse is again begun, and therefore if there were an ellipsis in the words alleged, it would have no relation to either of the former supplies, or if to either, to the latter, but indeed it hath to neither.*

* So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly then usually; Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἔτι ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν. So Ioh. 14. 19. *πρότερον ἔγενοντο ἐμοὶ ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*, *ἡμέραν ἐμὴν*; Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me? and Ioh. 15. 27. *ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἦν μετ' ἐμοὶ ἔτι*, because ye have been (or continued) with me from the beginning. Thus Nonnus, Ἐγὼ ἀρχῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμέρας ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν. Iohn 6. 24. ὅτι ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν ἡμέραν ἐμὴν. When the people saw that Jesus was not there. Nor onely doth S. Iohn use.

whether they interpret the former part (*before Abraham was*) of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the later (*I am*) of a pre-existence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent Christ with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that, which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all: and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation maketh our Saviour thus to speak. Do ye so much wonder how I should *have seen Abraham* who am *not yet fifty years old*? do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration (*Verily verily, I say unto you*) before *Abraham* shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, *the father of many Nations*, before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am*. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnifie my self: for what I speak is as true of you as 'tis of me; before *Abraham* be thus made *Abraham*, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I *have seen Abraham*. The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? do ye look upon my age, and ask *hast thou seen Abraham*? I confesse 'tis more then eighteen hundred years since that Patriarch died, and lesse then forty since I was born at Bethlehem: but look not on this computation, for before *Abraham* was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnifie my self in this, for ye were so. How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfaction to the question, or the least occasion of the Jews exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews; being those strained explications render the words of Christ not onely impertinent to the occasion, but vain and uselesse to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably incapable of any such interpretations; we must adhere unto that literal sense already delivered, by which it appeareth Christ had a being, as before John, so also before Abraham, (not onely before *Abram* became *Abraham*, but before *Abraham* was *Abram*) and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the Virgin.

Thirdly, we shall extend this preexistence to a farre longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But Christ was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood, is evident by the words of S. Peter, who saith, that *Christ was put to death in the Flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the dayes of Noah while the ark was a preparing*. From which words it appeareth, that Christ preached by the same Spirit, by the vertue of which he was raised from

1 Peter 3. 18,
19, 20.

from the dead : but that Spirit was not his Soul , but something of a greater power. Secondly , that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly , that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood , while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that Christ did preach unto those persons which in the dayes of Noah were disobedient all that time *the long-suffering of God waited* , and consequently so long as repentance was offer'd. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died ; which I shall not need here to prove , because those against whom I bring this Argument , deny it not. It followeth therefore , that he preached to them while they lived , and were disobedient ; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of Christ , did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand S. Peter of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles , when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom S. Peter speaks were disobedient in the dayes of Noah. But none of those to whom the Apostles preached were ever disobedient in the dayes of Noah. Therefore none of those to which the Apostles preached , were any of those of which S. Peter speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true , that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood , even while they lived , and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God , as if he personally had appeared on earth , and actually preached to that old world ; but by the † ministry of a Prophet , by the sending of Noah , *the eighth preacher of righteousness* : yet to do any thing by another not able to perform it without him , as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause , as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

Ἀποστόλων
τις ἡ ἀποστολή
ἐξ ἐξουσίας ἡ τοῦ
δοῦ. μαρτυροῦν
τὴν ἐν ἡμῶν
Νῶν.

† Prophetæ
ab ipso ha-
bentes do-
num in illum
prophetave-
runt. Barna-
bæ Epist.

a a Pet. 2. 5: I have thus translated this place of S. Peter, because it may add some advantage to the argument : for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son : and so by this we have gained the pre-existence of another 1000 years. However those words, ἀπὸ ὅσων Νῶν δίκαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, may be better interpreted then they are, when we translate them, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness. For first, if we look upon the Greek phrase, ὅσων Νῶν may be not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more, in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect of the rest, but only signifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the Supplices of Æschylus, Τὸ γὰρ πάλαιον σῖκος, τρίτον τὸ δ' ἐν δαίμονι Διὸς ἵκετο, we must not understand it, as if Honour due to parents were the third Commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable laws left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius, Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίῳ νομοθετήσαντα, καὶ ἅπλῃ νόμον αὐτοῦ τρεῖς ἐν Σαμῶντι δὲ φιλοσοφῶντες ἀγνοεῖν ἐκαστὸν τὸ σὸν. Γενεῖς τρεῖς. Οὗτος καὶ τοῖς ἀγνοεῖν. Ζῶα μὴ σίνειν. De Abstinent. l. 4. Which words are thus translated by S. Hierome, who hath made use of most part of that fourth book of Porphyrius, Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienses tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleusina revidere scribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non vescendum. Adver. Iovinianum, lib. 2. Where we see, Honour due to parents, the first precept, though by Æschylus called the third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus the Orator, καὶ τὰς Σαμῶντι δὲ αὐτῶν ἡγεμενὶς καὶ τὰς δὲ αὐτοῖς. From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that office, so that nine were necessarily before or above him, and many more might be after or below him; but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten ignorant waiting on the Σαμῶντι δὲ, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attick writers, especially Thucydides. And so we may understand S. Peter, that God preserved Noah (a preacher of righteousness) with seven more, of which he deserveth to be named the first, rather then the last or eighth. But secondly, the Ordinal ὅσων may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate, ὅσων Νῶν δίκαιοσύνης κήρυκα, Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness. For we read at the birth of Enos, that men began to call upon the name of the Lord, Gen. 4. 26. which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person: as the LXX, Ἰὼ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκκαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου αὐτοῦ Νῶν, and the vulgar Latine, Ille cepit invocare nomen Domini. The Jews have a tradition, that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the dayes of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a Preacher, or Prophet, and so the rest that followed him; and then Noah is the eighth.

The

Heb. I, 2.

Heb. II. 3.

* It being in both places expressed in the same phrase, by the same Author, δι

ἐξ οὗ τὸ αἰῶνα

ἰσχυροῦ. Heb.

I. 2. μέγα

καταπύξις

τῆς αἰῶνος

μακροῦ.

2 Heb. I. 8, 10,

11, 12.

† The Answer of Socinus to this conjunction is very weak: relying only upon the want of a Comma after καὶ in the Greek and Et in the Latine. and whereas it is evident, that there are distinctions in the Latine and Greek Copies after that conjunction, he flies to the Antientest Copies which all men know were most carelesse of distinctions, and urgeth that there is no addition of rursum or the like after Et, whereas in the Syriac translation we find expressly that addition, ܕܡܝܢ

The second part of the Argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a reall being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son, by whom in these last dayes God spake unto us, is he by whom also he made the worlds. So that, as through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so must we * also believe that they were made by the Son of God. Which the Apostle doth not onely in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequele prove. For shewing greater things have been spoken of him then ever were attributed to any of the Angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; among the rest, he saith, the Scripture spake a *unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* And not onely so, but also, *thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Now whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creatour of the world. For he must be acknowledged the maker of the earth, who laid the Foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens, who can say, they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour Christ. Nay the conjunction *And*, referres this place of the Psalmist † plainly to the former, of which he had said expressly, *but unto the Son he saith.* As sure then as *thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, was said unto the Son; so certain it is, *thou Lord hast laid the foundation of the earth*, was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostles connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and the creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the Apostle produced this Scripture to shew that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withall acknowledge that he created them: whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creatour, must also deny him to be understood as the destroyer. Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of, and to our Saviour, (or else the Apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the Spirit of S. Paul mistook the spirit of David;) being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; being the literall exposition is so clear that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphoricall; it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist, and the interpretation of an Apostle, that the Son of God created the world. Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testify as much, but onely that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they which deny this truth of the Creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two wayes to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of Creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation, then they endeavour to shew, that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressly of

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged reall unto Christ, we shall the easier perswade that likewise to be such, which is pretended to be metaphoricall. In the Epistle to the Colossians we read of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption through his blood*; and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other then Jesus Christ. He therefore it must be, who was thus described by the Apostle: *Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In which words our Saviour is expressly stiled the *† first-born of every Creature*, that is, begotten by God, as the *★ Son of his love*, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable Argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation, was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of Moses, as most consonant to his description; *for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth*; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation. Secondly, by a division which Moses never used, as describing the production only of corporeall substances: left therefore those immateriall beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted in Moses his description, he addeth *visible and invisible*; and left in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestiaall Hierarchy, any Order might seem exempted from an essentiall dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, *whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers*, and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power, by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood; as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his person, and the authority of his Action. For left we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumentall cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the finall as the efficient cause; *for all things were created by him, and for him.* Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by vertue of Gods conservation, *in whom we live, and move, and have our being*; left in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Conserver, as well as the Creatour; *for he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most compleat description of the Creatour of the world; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his Majesty, who is no where more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Col. I. 15, 16,
17.

17. The first born
of every crea-
ture is taken
by Origen for
an expression
declaring the
Divinity of
Christ, and ad-
fessed by him as
a phrase in op-
position to his
humanity to ex-
press the same. Ἐκπρω-
τότης καὶ οὐ τοῦ
ἀρχαίου ὅτι αὐ-
τὸν πρῶτον τῶν
ᾠκτιστῶν οὐκ ἔ-
γενετο ὡς τῶν
ἑσθλῶν ἀποστολῶν
πρῶτος ἀποστο-
λὸς ἰσ. Ἐννέμω-
ς ὁδὸς καὶ ὁ ἀνα-
δεδυκὼς καὶ ὁ ἀνα-
στὰς ἀπὸ τῆς πα-
ρὰ τῶν νεκρῶν
τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν
νοητέως ἀνθρώπου
πρῶτος ἀνὴρ, Ναυ-
θὸς καὶ ἔξελθὼς
ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ, ἀν-
δρῶντος ἐκ τῆς
ἀλμύρας ὅμιν καὶ
ἀλμύρας. lib. 2.
Adv. Celsam.

* In relation
to the preced-
ent words
τῆς υἱὸς τοῦ ἀρχαι-
ότερος αὐτοῦ, for
that υἱὸς ἀρχαι-
ότερος was the υἱὸς
ἀρχαιότερος (9)

Now

2 Cor. 5. 17.

Gal. 6. 15.

5, 6.

Eph. 2. 10.

a Eph. 4. 22, 23, 24.

b Colof. 3. 10.

* ἀνανεωσις or ἀνακαινισις. as the new man

ἡ ἀνέστη, or καὶ δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The first ὁ ἀνέστη, the last ὁ ἀνακαινισμὸς. both the same. Suidas,

ἀνακαινισμός, ἀνανεωσις ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνακαινισμοῦ.

which is the language of the New Testament. This renovation being thus called

καὶ ἡ ἀνέστη, the Ancients framed a proper word for it, which is,

ἀνακαινισμός. ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ καὶ τῇ νέῃ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸν νοῦν. Inft.

Qu & Resp. ad Græcos.

This new creation doth so necessarily inferre an alse-

ration, that it is called by S. Paul. a Metamorphosis; μεταμορφωσις τῆς ἀνακαινισμοῦ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν. Rom. 12. 2.

Now although this were sufficient to perswade us to interpret this place of the making of the world; yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compell us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of Creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literall, the other metaphoricall; one old, the other new; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature*, saith S. Paul; and again, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*. Instead of which words he had before, *saith working by love*. For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. From whence it is evident that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation, is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in. And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to the old man, which is a corrupt according to the deceitfull lusts: From whence the Apostle chargeth us to be renewed in the spirit of our mind, and to put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness, and true holiness; and which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him. The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in renovation, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a reall change though not substantiall, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation. Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the place produced out of the Epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of Creation mentioned in the Scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the Apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new Creation, as will thus appear: The object of the Creation mentioned in this place is of as great latitude and universality, as the object of the first creation, not onely expressed, but implied by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new Creation, it necessarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is alwaies opposed to the old; and if Adam had continued still in innocency, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old and new creation. Being then all men become not new, being there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love, being so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by *Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven and that are in earth*, when the greatest part of man-kind have no share in the new creation. Again, we cannot imagine that the Apostle should speak of the Creation in a general word, intending thereby onely the new, and while he doth so, expresse particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it. The Angels are all either good or bad: but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did Christ come to redeem

† Ad hoc Do-
minus susti-
nuit pari pro
anima nostra,
cum sit orbis
Terrarum
Dominus,
cui dixit die
ante consti-
tutionem Sæ-
culi, *Faciamus*
hominem ad
imaginem &
similitudinem
nostram. Bar-
nabæ Epist.

c.4. and again
 Αἰρεῖ γὰρ ἡ ἡρα-
 κλῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ
 ἀλγος τοῦ ἤ-
 Πιστοῦτος κατ'
 ἐκείνην. &c. c.5.
 Ἐκείνην οὖν
 τὴν αἰσὶν τοῦ
 καὶ γινώσκου
 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι
 φησὶ πολλὰ καὶ
 μακρὰ περιέρχον-
 τας ἐκείνην ἀπὸ
 δαίμωνος καὶ
 ὁμοῦν, κατὰ τὴν
 ἡ δαλκὴν ὅτι καὶ
 Πατὴρ α. πῶν
 γὰρ φησὶ καὶ τὴν
 κατὰ Μυσία
 κακομοιρία
 φησὶς γὰρ α. &
 Πατὴρ ἐκείνην
 τὴν, γινώσκου
 φάσι, καὶ ἐκείνην
 τὴν ἐκείνην
 τὴν λαοῦ, ὅσα
 φησὶς τὴν α.
 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι
 καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην
 καὶ τὴν Πιστοῦτος
 ἐκείνην κατ'
 ἐκείνην καὶ ὁμοῦν
 καὶ ἡσυχία.
 Crig. adv. Cel-
 sum. l. 2.
 a Job 1.12, 3.
 a Job 1.12, 3.
 the first word of
 Moses; whence
 the Syriac
 Translation,

בר שירי.
So Solomon,
מראש מקדמי ארץ
מִדְּבַר חֶזְקָה עַם
שִׁחוֹתָיו וְיוֹרֵ
Prov. 8. 23.
In principio
erat Sermo ;
in quo prin-
cipat is, מִדְּבַר
Sdome speaker
in latere ejus.
מִדְּבַר חֶזְקָה עַם
וְיוֹרֵ. מִדְּבַר חֶזְקָה עַם

delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood him. Onely that which as yet they knew not, was, that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was *Jesw Christ*. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in it self, so consonant to the Notion of the Word, and the apprehension of the Jews: it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation, as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth, a weak, uselesse, false discourse. For who will grant that *in the beginning*, must be the same with that in S. John's Epistle, *from the beginning*? especially when the very interpretation involves in it self a contradiction. For *the beginning* in S. John's Epistle is that, in which the Apostles saw, and heard, and touched the Word: *the beginning* in his Gospel was that, in which *the Word was with God*, that is, not seen, nor heard by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostles assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much; who therefore *came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel*? when we are sure that S. Matthew and S. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more than this; that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living, as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert, that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if *the beginning* be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but onely potentially or by designation. Secondly, 'tis a strange figurative speech, *the Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, especially in this Apostles method. *In the beginning was the word*; there *was* must signifie an actual existence: and if so, why in the next sentence, (*the Word was with God*), shall the same verb signify an objective being only? Certainly though to be in the beginning, be one thing, & to be with God, another; yet *to be*, in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this being understood of the knowledge of God, why we should grant that thereby is signified, he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of it self is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle *onely* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is, certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For except Gabriel be God, who came to the Virgin, except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the shepherds, be God, except Zachary and Elizabeth, except Simeon and Anna, except Joseph and Mary be God; it cannot be true, that he was known to God onely, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to passe by the third attribute, *and the word was God*, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the Apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, *the same was in the beginning with God*, and immediately subjoyned those words, *all things were made by him, and without him*

1 John I. 1.

John I. 31.

was not any thing made that was made; how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the later part, of the Apostles, who after the Ascension of our Saviour, did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered to do by Christ, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former, of all which Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new Expositours: For while John the Baptist onely preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done, which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification, without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of S. John, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently by the method of Argument, as the Apostle antecedently by the method of Nature, that in the beginning Christ was. He then who was in Heaven and descended from thence, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither; he who was before John the Baptist, and before Abraham; he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and existence before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary. But all these we have already shewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge, that *Jesus Christ* had a real being and existence, before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: Which is our first Assertion, properly opposed to the ³ Photinians?

*The Photinians were Hereticks, so called from

Pho^{tinus}, Bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallogræcia, and scholar to Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra. Pho^{tinus} de Gallogræcia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii Episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis Hæresin instaurare conatus est. S. Hieron. Catal. Eccl. Pho^{tinus} Sirmienfis Episcopus fuit à Marcello imbutus. Nam & Diaconus sub eo aliquandiu fuit. Hilar. Fragm. Wherefore when Epiphanius speaks thus of him, *ὁ μὴ ἔχει καὶ συγγένειαν*, it hath no relation to the original of his person, but his Hæresy; of which S. Hilary, Pellicus, natum Jesium Christum ex Maria, Pannonia defecit. De Trin. He was a man of singular parts and abilities; *Θεὸς ἦσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἡμεῖς*, says Sozom. 4.4. c. 6. *Τὸν δὲ πρὸς τὸ θεοῦ ἐκείνου λέγειν, καὶ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ τὸν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ τὸν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον*. Epiph. Her. 71. Erat & ingenii viribus valens, & doctrinæ opibus excellens, & eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque Verbone copiose & graviter disputaret & scriberet. Vincent. Lirin. c. 16. He is said by some to follow the Hæresy of Ebion. Hebionis Hæresin instaurare conatus est, says S. Hierome. and S. Hilary ordinarily underhands him by the name of Hebion, and sometimes expounds himself, Hebion, qui est Pho^{tinus}. But there is no similitude in their doctrines, Hebion being more Jew then Christian, and teaching Christ as much begotten by Joseph, as born of Mary. Philaster will have him agree wholly with Paulus Samosatensis in omnibus. Epiphanius with an *ὁ μὴ εἶναι, καὶ πρὸς τὸν κόσμον*. Socrates and Sozomen, with him, and with Sabellius: whereas he differed from them both, especially from Sabellius, as being farre from a Patripassian. Marcellus Sabellianæ hæresis assertor extiterat: Pho^{tinus} vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, à Sabellio quidem in anobis dissentiens, sed innotum Christi ex Maria prædicabat. Severus Hift. Sac. Wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of Antiquity what did properly belong unto Pho^{tinus}, because I think it is not yet done, and we find his hery in the propriety of it to begin and spread again. Pho^{tinus} mentis cæcitate deceptus, in Christo verum, & substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante omnia sæcula genitum esse non credit. Leo de Nato. Christi, Serm. 4. Ecce Pho^{tinus} hominem tantum profectore Dei Filium; dicendum non fuisse ante beatam Mariam. Lucifer Claris. Si quis in Christo sic veritatem prædicat animæ & carnis, ut veri-

The

tatem in eo nolit accipere Deitatis, id est, qui sic dicit Christum hominem, ut Deum neget, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed Photinianus Hæreticus. *Fulg. ad Donat. l. 16.* Φωτεινὸς ἄλλοι ἀδελφοὶ λέγει ὅτι γινώσκοντες, Θεὸς μὴ λόγος ἦν ὁ τέκνον, καὶ ὁ ἐκ μήτρας γεννηθεὶς ἀνθρώπον ὑποτίθει δὲ διηρημένον Θεῷ. *Theodor. Hamil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil. p. 3. c. 10.* Anathematizamus Photinum, qui Hebionis Hæresim instaurans, Dominum Iesum Christum tantum ex Maria Virgine confiteretur. *Damasius Profess. Fidei. c. 28.* ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Χριστὸν μὴ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Μαριάμ καὶ δούλεα αὐτὴν ὑπέσχετο. ἔξ οὗ, φησὶ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑπέλαθεν ἐκ' αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐγέννησεν ἐκ Πνέματος ἁγίου. *Epiphani. "Ελεος ὁ αἰς τοῦ αἵματος ἡμεῶν πατοκεῖται, ὅς ἐστι λόγος τὸ πᾶντα δημιουργήσας· τὸν δὲ Θεὸν ἁπάντων ἡμεῖς οὐκ ὑπαίξομεν τὴν ἡμῶν ἐκ παλαιόθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαριάμ γινώσκοντες τὸν Χριστὸν ἀπογόνον.* *Sozomen l. 4. c. 6.* Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse & solitarium, & more Judaico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium asserit, cui principium adscribit ex Mariæ & hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solum nos personam Dei Patris, & solum Christum hominem colere debere. *Vinc. Lirinensis Adv. Hæres. c. 17.* In the Disputation framed by Vigilius out of the seventh book of S. Hilary, as I conceive, Photinus rejecting the opinion of Sabellius, (whom Sozrates and Sozomen said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own. Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Iesum Christum, ex Maria Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum atque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, à Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus & eximio Divinitatis honore donatus. and again; Ego Domino nostro Iesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, & per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum. *Vide eundem lib. 2. Adv. Eutychen.* Ignorat etiam Photinus magnum pietatis, quod Apostolus memorat, sacramentum, qui Christi ex Virgine fatetur exordium: Et propterea non credit line initio substantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confiteretur ex Virgine. *Fulg. ad Thrasim. l. 1.* Gregory Nazianzen, according to his custom, gives a very brief, but remarkable expression. Φωτεινὸς τὸν λόγον Χριστὸν ἔκ τῆς Μαρίας ἀργαῶν. *Orat. 26.* But the Opinion of Photinus cannot be better understood then by the Condemnation of it, in the Council of Sirmium; which having set out the Confession of their Faith in brief, addeth many and various Anathema's, according to the several Heresies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus. Si quis secundum præscientiam vel prædestinationem ex Maria dicit filium esse, & non ante sæcula ex Patre natum, apud Deum esse, & per eum facta esse omnia, Anathema sit. *The 13. 14. and 15. also were particulars directed against him, as S. Hilary hath observed; but the last of all is most material.* Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante sæcula subsistentem, & ministrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem non dicat, sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo & Christum & Filium nominatum esse, & initium accepisse ut sit Deus, dicat, Anathema sit. Upon which the Observation of S. Hilary is this. Concludi damnatio ejus Hæresis, propter quam conventum erat, (that is the Photinian) expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur, oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur. *S. Hilary. de Synod. contra Arianos.* Thus was Photinus Bishop of Sirmium condemned by a Council held in the same City. They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arians, Semi-Arians and Catholics; καὶ οὕτως ὁ Φωτεινὸς καὶ οἱ τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ κατέχευον καὶ διέκλυον ὑπόμνητον, πείνουν ἡμέρας καὶ νύκτας καὶ πᾶν πᾶντα. *l. 2. c. 29.* And because his History is very obscure and intricate, take this brief Catalogue of his condemnations. We read that he was condemned at the Council of Nice, and at the same time by a Council at Rome under Sylvester; but this is delivered onely in a forged Epilogus Concilii Romani. He was then first condemned with Marcellus his master, as Sulpitius Severus relates, probably by the Synod at Constantinople: for in that Marcellus was deprived. *Sozom. l. 2. 33. Socrat. l. 1. 36.* Secondly, his Heresy is renounced in the second Synod at Antioch. *Athanas. de Syn. Socrat. l. 1. 19.* Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of Sardes. *Epiphani. & Sulpitius Severus.* Fourthly, by a Council at Milan. *S. Hilary. Fragm.* Fifthly, in a Synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western Bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed. *S. Hilary. Fragm.* Sixthly, he was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern Bishops, and being convicted by Basil Bishop of Ancyra, was banished from thence. *S. Hilary. Epiph. Socrat. Sozom. Vigilius.* Indeed he was so generally condemned not onely then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as S. Hierome testifies, and the Synodic Epistle of the Aquileian Council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. Ἦδη γὰρ καὶ δὲ νομοθεσίᾳ ἐκείνῃ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ ἡπαγματικὸν αἶμας, says Epiphanius, who lived not long after him. So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the Heretick, who railed at S. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an Epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though in a mean translation) delivered by Facundus. Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, & proximus salvere, bene faciens nequam in utero inducere, quem credidisti Deum. *Facund. ad Iustinian. l. 4.*

The second Assertion, next to be made good, is that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was not any created, but the divine essence, by which he alwayes was truly, really, and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first Assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God: from whence we inferred his preexistence in the beginning assuring us as much that he was God, as that he was. *For he that built all things* *Heb. 3. 4.*

beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, then by having the same divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin, was the divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

Secondly, He who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God, (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God) must of necessity be truly and essentially God: because there can be no equality between the divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the Virgins womb, and existence in his humane nature. For, *being* (or rather † *subsisting*) *in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our Assertion. First, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly, that he was in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared a servant, when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For, they were not all slaves which ever suffer'd such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them, or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation, never lived as a servant unto any Master on earth. 'Tis true, at first he was subject, but as a Son, to his reputed father and undoubted mother. When he appear'd in publick, he lived after the manner of a Prophet, and a Doctour sent from God, accompanied with a family, as 'twere of his Apostles, whose Master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that Office, and obedient onely unto God. The form then of a servant which he took upon him, must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was, when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was *made flesh*, sent *in the likeness of sinfull flesh*, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was *made of a woman*, *made under the law*, and so obliged to perform the same; which law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and liv'd in a mean, low, and abject condition; *as a root out of a drie ground, he had no form nor comeliness*, and *when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him*; but *was despised and rejected of men*, *a man of sorrows*, and *acquainted with grief*: In that he was thus made man, he *took upon him the form of a servant*. Which is not mine, but the Apostles explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not onely not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus; *He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the * original text, and three

Philip. 2. 6, 7.
† In effigie Dei constitutus. Tertul.
In figura Dei constitutus. Cyr.

* Rom. 8. 3.

b Gal. 4. 4.

c Isa. 53. 2. 3.

* αὐτὸν ἐκείνου, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιωματι ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτοῦ. which is also exactly observed by the Vulgar Latine, Sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum fa-

ctus; where ἑαυτοῦ is added by apposition to λαβών, and have both equal relation to ἐκείνου or, which is all one, ἐκείνου λαβὼν μορφὴν δούλου.

distinct

^a Phil. 2. 8.

† ἵνα ἑαυτὸν
καὶ ὅσον, ὡς ἑαυτὸν
ὁμοιωσάμενος. For
in both these
verses there is
but one con-
junction, joyn-
ing together
two acts of our
Saviour, his
first exinaniti-
on, or *inimor*,
and his farther
humiliation, or
inarenor: the
rest are all
participles ad-
ded for expli-
cation to the
verbs.

^b Psal. 40. 6.
^c Exod. 21. 6.
^d Dent. 15. 17.

distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christs exinanition, with an explication shewing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literall translation, *But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfie him, by taking the form of a servant; if any still question, how he took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostles resolution, by being made in the likeness of men. Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to adde another act of Christs humiliation *a And being found in fashion as a man,* being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, *he humbled himself, and became* (or rather, *† becoming*) *obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse.* As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation on the Epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are clearly in the Psalmist, *b Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened:* the Apostle appropriateth the sentence to Christ; *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* Now being the ^cboaring of the ear under the law was a note of perpetual servitude, being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist, and changed by the Apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth, that when Christs body first was fram'd, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again, it appeareth out of the same Text, that Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume; must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and being so, to think it no robbery to be equall with God, and notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied, but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant but by the emptying himself, & all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulnesse, as to fill any thing which hath no emptinesse. But the fulnesse which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that exinanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coevall with that precedent plenitude; then must we confesse, Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second Proposition.

Again, it is as evident from the same Scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God, as the form of a servant; and did as really subsist in the divine nature, as in the nature of man. For he was so

in

in the form of God, as thereby to be * equall with God. But no other form beside the essentiall, which is the divine nature it self, could inferre an equality with God. To whom will ye liken me, and make me equall? saith the Holy one. There can be but one infinite, eternall and independent being; and there can be no comparison between that, and whatsoever is finite, temporall, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equall with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternall, and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, in the form of God, not elsewhere mention'd, is used by the Apostle with a respect unto that other, of the form of a servant, exetetically continued in the likeness of man; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as reall and essentiall as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the Apostles words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christs exinanition. But by the form, is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the likeness, infallibly meant the reall nature of man: nor doth the fashion in which he was found, destroy, but rather assert the truth of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the expresse words of S. Paul, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signifie the divine,

So whom the Greeks call ἰσοῦς, Homer ἰσὺς Διὸς. Odyss. O.

Τὸν αὐτὸν ἰσὺν θεῶν ἰσοκρίτους εἰσέειπον.

where ἰσὺς has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσέειπον, but of a Noun referred to the antecedent Τὸν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν αὐτὸν ἰσὺν. The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange, ἰσὺς Διὸς, est spectari tanquam Deum. As if he should have said, εἰσέειπον signifies spectant, therefore ἰσὺς signifies spectari. This he was forced to put off thus; because the strength of our interpretation, rendering an equality, lies in the verb substantive τὸ εἶναι. as Dionysius of Alexandria very anciently. καὶ ὡς ἰσὺς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Διὸς ἰσὺς, Διὸς ἰσὺς ἰσὺς, ἰσὺς Διὸς ἰσὺς. Epist. ad Paulum Samosat. For we acknowledge that ἰσὺς by it self oft times signifieth no more then instar, and so inferreth nothing but a similitude: as we find it frequently in the book of Job. Where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle כִּי, as כִּי לֵילִי, quasi in nocte, ἰσὺς νυκτός. 5. 14. כִּי כַּסֵּף, sicut caseum, ἰσὺς τυφ. 10. 10. כִּי רֶקֶב, quasi putredo, Sym. ὁμοίως σπυρίδι, LXX ἰσὺς ἀσπ. 13. 28. כִּי מַיִם, sicut aquam, ἰσὺς ὕδατος. 15. 16. כִּי עָפָר, tanquam lignum, ἰσὺς ξύλου. 24. 20. כִּי חֹרֶר, sicut lutum, ἰσὺς ἄμμου. 27. 16. כִּי כְּסִי, sicut vestimento, ἰσὺς δαπνοῦ. 29. 14. כִּי בָקָר, quasi bos, ἰσὺς βου. 40. 10. Where we see the vulgar Latine useth for the Hebrew כִּי quasi, sicut, tanquam, the LXX ἰσὺς. Sometime it answereth to no word in the Original, but supplieth a similitude understood, not expressed in the Hebrew: as כִּי, tanquam pullum, ἰσὺς ὄνου. 11. 12. כִּי אֶבֶן, & lapis, ἰσὺς λίθου. 28. 2. כִּי לֶחֶם, luto, ἰσὺς ἄμμου. 30. 19. Once it rendreth an Hebrew word, rather according to the intention, then the significacion; כִּי לֶחֶם, comparabitur cineri. Ad verbum, proverbium cineris, ἰσὺς σπυρίδι. 13. 12. So that in all these places it is used adverbially for instar, and in none hath the addition of τὸ εἶναι in it. As for that answer of Socinus; that Christ cannot be God because he is said to be equal with God, Tantum abest ut ab eo quod Christus sit æqualis Deo sequatur ipsum esse æternum & summum Deum, ut potius ex hoc ipso necessario consequatur non esse æternum & summum Deum. Nemo enim sibi ipsi æqualis esse potest. Socinus ad 8. caput Wieki. as if there could be no predication of equality where we find a substantial identity: it is most certainly false, because the most exact speakers use such language as this is. There can be no expressions more exact and pertinent then those which are used by Geometricians, neither can there be any better judges of equality then they are; but they most frequently use that expression in this notion, proving an equality and inferring it from identity. As in the fifth Proposition of the first Element of Euclide, two lines are said to contain an angle equal to the angle contained by two other lines, because they contained the same angle, or ὡς ἓν γωνίαν, & the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or ὡς ἓν ἰσὺς. In the same manner certainly may the Son be said to be equal to the Father in essence or power, because they both have the same essence and power, that is, ὡς ἓν οὐσία καὶ δύναμις καὶ ἐξουσία. a 1sa. 40. 25. 46. 5.

as the likenesse of man, the humane nature; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a reall existence before he was begotten of the Virgin, and that the being which he had, was the divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly, He which is expressly stiled Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation; as he is after, so was before any time assigneable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other. *I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.* But Christ is expressly called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. He so proclaimed himself, *by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.* Which answereth to that solemn call and proclamation in the Prophet, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israell my called.* He comforteth S. John with the Majesty of this title. *Fear not, I am the first and the last.* Which words were spoken by one like unto the Son of man, by him that liveth and was dead, and is alive for ever more, that is, undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the Church of Smyrna in her tribulation by virtue of the same description. *These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive.* He ascertaineth his coming unto Judgement with the same assertion, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* And in all these places this Title is attributed unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of restriction or limitation, without any assignation of any particular in respect of which he is the first or last: in the same latitude and eminence of expression, in which it is or can be attributed to the supreme God. There is yet another Scripture, in which the same description may seem of a more dubious interpretation: *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning & the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* For being it is the Lord who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent & the following words imply, then is he certainly that Lord, which is and which was, & which is to come, the Almighty; that is, the supreme eternal God, of the same divine essence with the Father, who was before described by him which is, & which was, & which is to come, to whom the six wing'd beasts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, & is, and is to come;* as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to Moses. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; then did he so describe himself unto S. John, & expresse his supreme Deity, that by those words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending,* he might be known to be the one Almighty and eternal God: and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being Christ hath so immediately, & with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same stile upon him by which the Father did expresse his God-head; it followeth, that he hath declar'd himself to be the supreme, almighty, and eternal God. And being thus the Alpha and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then

Isa. 41, 4.

48, 12.

44, 6.

Rev. 1, 11.

Isa. 48, 12.

Rev. 1, 17.

13.

2, 8.

Rev. 22, 13.

*With the Article, so much elsewhere stood upon, τὸ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω.

The Alpha & the Omega, the first and the last.

For we must not take τὸ α as the Grammarians do; by which they signify only the letter written in that figure, and called by that name.

As appeareth by Eratosthenes, who was called Βίττα, not τὸ Βίττα; as Suidas corruptly. Hesychius Illustris, from whom Suidas had that passage; Εξολο-

δομεν δὴ τὸ αὐτοῦ Βίττα, ὅτι τὸ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω.

And Mariannus Heracleota in Periplo-

α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω, ὁ α καὶ ὁ ω.

a Rev. 1, 8.

4.

b Rev. 4, 8.

c Exod. 3, 14.

then he had was the divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the almighty and eternal God.

Fourthly, He whose glory Isaiah saw in the year that King Uzziah died, had a being before Christ was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God: For he is expressly call'd *the Lord, Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth*; which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But Christ was he whose glory Isaiah saw, as S. John doth testify, saying, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him*: and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly Christ: for of him the Apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. *These things spake Jesus and departed. But though he, (that is, Jesus) had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that is, Christ, who wrought those miracles.* The reason why they believed not on him was, *that the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfill'd, which he spake; Lord, who hath believed our report?* And as they did not, so they could not believe in Christ, because that *Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardned their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them.* For those who God foresaw, and the Prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the Jewes refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of whom the Prophet spake: For *these things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him.* Now if the glory which Esaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Esaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardned hearts belong unto these Jewes, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that Prophecy upon that people which saw our Saviours miracles, depend upon Isaiah's vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore S. John infallibly hath taught us, that the Prophet saw the glory of Christ; and the Prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he, whose glory then he saw, was the one omnipotent and eternal God; and consequently both together have seal'd this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternal God-head.

Lastly, He who being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner, as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other then the divine essence. Because all novelty is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God, who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred Scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and eternal God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already prov'd, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore were it not said in the Scriptures, there are many Gods; did not he himself who is supreme call others so; we durst not give that name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to have alledg'd that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternal Deity: whereas now we are answered, that there are Gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name, that he is the one eternal God. But if Christ be

Isa. 61, 3.

John 12, 41.

36.

37.

38.

39.

40.

41.

Psal. 82. 6.

5.

Col. 1. 9.

John 16. 30.

John 1. 12.

1 Cor. 8. 5.

6.

none of those many Gods, and yet he God, then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbred with them, is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We read in the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the most High.* But we must not reckon Christ among those Gods, we must not number the onely-begotten Son among those children. For *they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darknesse:* and whosoever were Gods onely as they were, either did or might do so. Whereas Christ, *in whom alone dwelt all the fulnesse of the God-head bodily,* is not only distinguished from, but opposed to such Gods as those, by his disciples saying, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things;* by himself proclaiming, *I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darknesse.* S. Paul hath told us *there be gods many; and lords many,* but withall hath taught us, that *to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ.* In which words as the Father is oppos'd as much unto the many Lords, as many Gods; so is the Son as much unto the many Gods, as many Lords; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many Gods, and whosoever is called God must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many Gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we read him often stiled God: it followeth, that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternal God.

Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternal power and God-head. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it alwayes signifieth the supreme power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an article by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead, as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these two rules they have raised unto themselves this Observation, that whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an Article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those Gods who are excluded from the Majesty of the eternall Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the Articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them, or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission (whereof examples are innumerable;) though, if those rules were granted, yet would not their Conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confesse) without an Article, and therefore the same name may signifie the same God, when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so farre as can concern the omission of the Article: Yet, to complete my demonstration, I shall shew first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ. Secondly, that the same name with the Article affixed is attributed unto him. Thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the Article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate, which hath as great a virtue to signifie that excellency, as the Article could have.

S. Paul unfolding the mystery of Godlinesse, hath delivered six Propositions

1 Tim. 3. 16.

* *Acts* 8.5, 35.
9.20. 11.20.
17.3, 18.19,
13.
Rom. 16. 25.
2 *Cor.* I. 19.
II, 4.
Phil. I. 18.
† *Gal.* I. 15,
16.
* *Acts* 19. 4.
a *Gal.* 2. 16.
b *Acts* 16. 31.

Deus i.e. vo-
luntas ipsius
de fervendis
hominibus
per homines
infirmos &
mortales per-
fectè pate-
facta est. *om.*

rits

*For being the Epistle was written in the Greek language, it is enough, if all those Copies do

rit; not the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore, that, whereas the Son is the onely Person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here joyntly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed universally in the * Copies of the Original language, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

agree. Now we neede were troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place. Suspectum nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres; Latinus, Syrus, Arabs & Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt ὁ ἱερωνῆς. I confesse the Vulgar Latine reads it otherwise then the Greeke. Quod manifestatum est in carnis et non potest denique the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeeth with the Latine; and both seem to have read ὁ instead of Θεός. But the joynt consent of the Greek Copies and Interpreters are above the authority of those two Translators; and the Arabick set forth in the Biblia polyglotta agreeeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath further observed is of far greater consideration. Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55. illud Θεός hic positum à Nestorianis. For if at first the Greeks read ὁ ἱερωνῆς, and that ὁ were altered into Θεός by the Nestorians; then ought we to correct the Greek Copy by the Latine, and confesse there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our Argument. But first, it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the Original Θεός, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overthrowne their own Assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor borne of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, καὶ τὸν ἀνάστατον αὐτὸν κατασάβον. Concil. Ephes. part. 1. cap. 17. Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because the Catholick Greeks read it Θεός before there were such Hereticks; so called. Nestoriani à Nestorio Episcopo Patriarcha Constantianopolitano. Aug. Hæres. Nestorius from whom that Heresy began, was Patriarch of Constantinople after Siminnus, Siminnus after Atticus, Atticus after Nestarius, who succeeded Ioannes, vulgarly called Chrysostomus. But S. Chrysostome read not Θεός, but Θεός, as appears by his Commentaries upon the place. Θεός ἱερωνῆς ἐν Caput, ταῦτις ἐν διμωρῶς. And S. Cyril, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon the first appearance of his Heresy, wrote two large Epistles to the Queens Pulcheria and Eudocia; in both which he maketh great use of this Text. In the first, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus; Τίς οὖν ἐὰν σαρκαποιεύεαι; ἢ δὴλοι, ὅτι πάντα τε καὶ πάντα; οὐ ἐκ θεοῦ παλλεις λέγεται. ὅτι γὰρ ἵσα μὲτα τοῦ τίς ὑποστάσις μυστήριον, Θεός ἱερωνῆς ἐν Capiti. Wherefore in S. Paul he read Θεός God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text verbatim, he manageth it thus against Nestorius. Εἰ Θεός ὃν λέγουσιν ἐαυθαρπίστως λέγουσι, καὶ εἰ δι πάθεος τοῦ ἡδυνώ, αἷμα ἐκ οὐκ ἰδέει διαχρίστιν, μὲτα δὲ τίς ποτε ἐμελομένηται μὲτα τίς τοῦ τίς ὑποστάσις μυστήριον. εἰς ἀπράκτου νοεῖ κενὸν ἐ Χριστός, πᾶς ἐ σαρκαποιεύεαι καὶ τοῦ πᾶς ὅχι πάσαν ἐαυτοῦ, ὅτι πᾶς ἀπράκτου ἐν Capiti τι ἐστίν, καὶ ἐκ ἀντίφραστος ὁρᾷ τοῦ τίς. And in the explanation of his second Anathematisme, he maketh use of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypothetical Union; giving it this gloss or exposition. τί ἐστὶν τὸ ἱερωνῆς ἐν Capiti; ταῦτις λόγον σαρκὸς οὐ ἐκ θεοῦ παλλεις λέγει, &c. The same he urgeth in his Scholion De Trigenis Incarnatione. So also Theodoret contemporary with S. Cyril, Θεός γάρ ἐκ θεοῦ θεός υἱός, καὶ ἀπαρτοῖ ἐξεν την φύσιν, δηλῶ πάσαν ἐαυθαρπίστως ἔλεγε, σαρκὸς ἢ ἡμέας ὄνο φέρους ἰδιότητα, ἐν Capiti γὰρ την θέλας ἐξεν φαυραβία σούον. Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεός into the Greek text; but that he which put it in was cast out of his Bishoprick for a Nestorian. His words are these. Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis impersturaverunt, sicut Macedonius Constantianopolitanus Episcopus, quibz Anastasio Imperatore ideo à Civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, & illum Apostoli locum ubi dicit, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu, per cognationem Græcaturum literarum O in Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit qui, hoc est Ως menofyllabum Græcum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit & fecit Θεός, id est ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem. Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus.

Hincm. Opusc. 55. c.18. Now whereas Hincmarus says expulsus legitur, we read not in Eusegius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Iohannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his Bishoprick for any such falsations; it is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus a Deacon of the Church of Carthage, who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the Ecclesiastical Histories and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which, chap. 19. we have the same Relation, onely with this difference, that O is not turned into Θ, but into Ω, and fo Ω becomes not Θεός but Ως. So that first the Greek Copies are not said to have read ὁ Θεός, but Ως, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the vulgar Latine. Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter changed, no such mutation can of Ω make Θεός, it may Ως, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutyichian, and he ejected him as he did other Catholick Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianisme, but for other reasons. Howsoever Macedonius could not falsifie all the Greek Copies, when as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge Θεός. And if he had been ejected for substituting Ως, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring Ως, which we find not in any copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsifie the Text by reading Θεός ἱερωνῆς, but that the Ancient Greek Fathers read it σο; and consequently, being the Greek is the Original, this Lesson must be acknowledged Authentical.

Again,

Again, S. Paul speaketh thus to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, *Take heed unto your selves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* In these words this doctrinal proposition is clearly contained; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the Text, which can by any Grammatical construction be joyned with the verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, *and without bloodshed there is no remission*; if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joyned to his * Church, be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this Proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture-truth; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God, hath so purchased the Church. *We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God hath purchased us with his own blood. But no other person which is, or is called God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatourship; and *there is but one Mediatour between God and men*: and the Church is *sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this blood signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it *by his own blood*; for then it would follow, that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Beside it is very observable, that this particular phrase of *his own blood*, is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of † another: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him, yet we cannot but acknowledge that the blood and death was of another then the Father. *c Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place: and whereas the High priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* He then which purchased us, wrought it by his own blood,

made *δῦ*, when it is so often written *δῦ*, not *Χεῖρ*. Some MSS. as the Alexandrian, Cantabrigian, and New Coll. MSS. read it *τῷ Κυρίῳ*, and the Interpreter of Irenæus regere Ecclesiam Domini. 1.3. c. 14. others represent *Χεῖρ* *τῷ* *δῦ*, followed by the Arabick Interpreter, which makes not at all against our argument; but, because in this particular unusual, not like to be true. The Syriac translating it Christi, (ܡܫܝܚܐ), not Domino, as it is in the Latine Translation) gives rather an exposition then a version. a 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. b Heb. 10. 10. 1 *δῦ* *αἷμα* is opposed to *αἷμα* *ἀλλόθεν*. And therefore it is observable that the Author of the Racovian Catechisme in his Answer to this place of Scripture doth never make the least mention of *δῦ* or proprium, but onely affirmes that the blood of Christ may be called the blood of God the Father; & tondem verbis did Socinus answer to Wicki before, but in his whole answer concealed the force of *δῦ*, whereas the strength of our Argument lies in those words, *δῦ* *τῷ* *δῦ* *αἷμα*, or as the Alexandrian MS. and one mentioned by Beza, *δῦ* *τῷ* *αἷμα* *τῷ* *δῦ*. c Heb. 9. 12.

Acts 20. 28.

* *τῷ* *ἐκκλησίᾳ* *τῷ* *δῦ*. For though the Church be properly the Church of Christ, Mat. 16. 18. Col. 1. 24. and in the plural we read once *αἱ* *ἐκκλησίαι* *τῷ* *Χριστῷ*, Rom. 16. 16. as we do of the Churches of God, 1 Cor. 11. 16. 2 Thess. 1. 4. 2. 14. yet *ἡ* *ἐκκλησία* *τῷ* *δῦ* is frequently used, as 1 Cor. 1. 2. 10. 32. 15. 9. 11. 22. 2 Cor. 1. 1. 13. 1 Tim. 3. 5. 15. but *ἡ* *ἐκκλησία* *τῷ* *Χριστῷ* is not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this Text, or to phanfy it first, written *Χεῖρ*, and then

Rom. 3. 25.
 ὅτι ἀνεβλήθη ὁ
 θεὸς ἰναστήσειν
 διὰ τῆς πίστεως
 ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀ-
 γαθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἐν
 τῇ ἀγαθότητι
 αὐτοῦ.

Eph. 1 6, 7.

Acts 3. 26.

Eph. 1. 9.

Gal. 1: 4.

Col. 1. 13, 14.

Heb. 9. 16:

Matth. 1. 23.
 ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος
 ἕξει υἱόν, καὶ
 ἑμμανουὴλ, ὅ
 τίς ἐστὶν μεθερμ-
 ενεύμενον, Μεθ
 ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.

as an High priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal Priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when S. Paul speaketh of the redemption *that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness; *his*, that is, *his own righteousness*, hath reference to God the Father; but *his*, that is, *his own blood*, must be referred to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of this acknowledgment he brings in *the beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood*, as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Christ hath blessed us, and the Apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us: which is true, because *he sent his son to bless us*. Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father, and the Apostle saith, the Father hath made known unto us the mystery of his will; because he sent his Son to reveal it. Christ hath delivered us, and the Father is said to deliver us from the power of darkness; not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these general Acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these Acts. For though 'tis true, that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us: but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us; the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son; and therefore the Apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, *who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood*. Now this blood is not onely the blood of the new Covenant, and consequently, of the Mediatour: but the nature of this Covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testatour; for *where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testatour*. But the Testatour which died, is not, cannot be the Father, but the Son, and consequently, the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but onely Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three Assertions, that the name of God absolutely taken and placed subjectively, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

The second, That the name of God invested by way of excellency with an Article, is attributed in the Scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good. He which is call'd Emmanuel, is named God by way of Excellency; for that name, saith S. Matthew, *being interpreted, is God with us*, and in that interpretation the Greek † Article is prefixed. But Christ is called Emmanuel; *that is might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Virgin shall*

shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel. Therefore he is that God with us, which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name. For it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is call'd Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as Moses built an Altar ^a and call'd the name of it, *Jehovah Nissi*, and Gideon another, ^b call'd *Jehovah Shalom*, and yet neither Altar was *Jehovah*: as Jerusalem was call'd, ^c the Lord our righteousness, and yet that City was not the Lord. Because these two notions which are conjoined in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First, he is Emmanuel, that is, *with us*, for he hath ^d dwelt among us: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, ^e *I am with you alway, even to the end of the world*. Secondly, he is El, and that name was given him, as the same Prophet testifieth, ^f *For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellour, the Mighty God*. He then who is both properly called El, that is, God, and is also really Emmanuel, that is, *with us*, he must infallibly be that Emmanuel, who is God with us. Indeed if the name Emmanuel were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, ^g *God is with us*, as the Lord our righteousness, and the Lord is there, must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem; then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his Church: and if we under the Gospel had been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviours name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the Messias, as the name of Jesus. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the Evangelicall interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supream Deity.

Again, He to whom S. Thomas said, ^h *my Lord, and my God*, or rather, *the Lord of me, and the God of me*, he is that God, before whose name the Greek Article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But S. Thomas spake these words ⁱ to Christ. For Jesus spake unto Thomas, and Thomas answered and said unto him, *My Lord and my God*. And in these ^j words he made confession of his faith:

^a Exod. 17. 15.
^b Judges 6. 24.
^c Jer. 33. 16.
^d John 1. 14.
^e Matt. 28. 20.
^f Isa. 9. 6.
^g Ezek. 48. 35.
^h John 20. 28.
ⁱ Indeed it hath been answered, that these words are not to be referred to Christ, but to God the Father. So Theodorus Mopsuestenus in his Commentary on S. John Thomas quidem cum sic credidisset, Dominus meus & Deus meus dicit, non ipsum Dominum & Deum dicens, (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat & Deum esse eum qui surrexit) sed quasi pro miraculoso facto Deum collaudat.

Syn. V. Collat. 4. As if Thomas had intended onely to have praised God for raising Christ. But first, it is plaine, that Thomas answered Christ; secondly that he spake unto him, that is, to Christ, and consequently that the words which he spake belong to Christ; thirdly, that the words are a Confession of his faith in Christ, as our Saviour doth acknowledge. And whereas Franciscus Davidis did object, that in a Latine Testament be found, not & dixit ei, but & dixit without ei, it is sufficiently discountenanced by Socinus in his Epistle, affirming that all the Greeke and Latine Copies had it, except that one which he had found: and therefore the omission must be imputed to the negligence of the Printer. ^k ὁ Κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. Either in these words there is an Ellipsis of εἰ σοῦ, Thou art my Lord, thou art my God; or an Antiprosis, the Nominative case used for the Vocative, as ἰδοὺ, ἰδοὺ, ὁ Θεός μου; ὁ Θεός μου. Mark 15. 34. ἀλλὰ ὁ πατήρ, Mark 14. 36, and Χαῖν ὁ Θεός μου; ἰδοὺ. John 19. 3. If it be an Ellipsis of the Verb εἶ, so frequent in the Scriptures, and of the Person sufficiently understood in the preceding Pronoun; then is it evident that ὁ Θεός is attributed unto Christ, for when S. Thomas said unto him, Thou art ὁ Θεός μου. If it be an Antiprosis, though the construction require not a verb, yet the signification virtually requireth as much; which is equivalent: for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm him to be so. Neither can it be objected that the Article & serveth onely in the place of εἶ, as signifying that the Nominative is to be taken for the Vocative case; because the Nominative may as well stand vocatively without an Article, as ἰδοὺ, ὁ Θεός μου, Matt. 1. 20. and ἰδοὺ ὁ Θεός μου, Matt. 20. 30, 31. and therefore when the Vocative is invested with an Article, it is as considerable as in a Nominative. And being these words were an expression of the Apostles faith, as Christ understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a Proposition; because no act of our faith can be expressed, where the Object is not at least a virtual Proposition. And in that Proposition, ὁ Θεός must be the predicate, and Christ to whom these words are spoken must also be the subject. It can

T

for

not therefore be avoided, but that S. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an Article. Indeed to me there is no doubt but S. Thomas in these words did make as true and real a confession of his faith concerning the Person of Christ, as S. Peter did, when he answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. Matt. 16. 16. and consequently, that ὁ υἱος and ὁ θεός do as properly belong unto him, as S. Peter's ὁ Χριστός , and ὁ υἱός . As therefore Christ said to his Disciples. Vos vocatis me, ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου , καὶ ὁ υἱος ; & bene dicitis, sum etenim, John 13. 13. So he might have replied to Thomas, You call me, ὁ υἱος and ὁ θεός . and you say well, for I am so. As for the Objection of Socinus, that though θεός be here spoken of Christ, and that with an Article ὁ , yet that Article is of no force because of the following pronoun μεν , it is most groundless; for if ὁ θεός be the supreme God, then ὁ υἱός μεν , must be my supreme God: as when David speaks to God, ὁ θεός , ὁ υἱός μεν , $\text{ὁ θεός σου ὁ ἐκλεκτός}$, Psal. 62. 1. the latter is of as great importance as the former. So again Psal. 42. 5. $\text{ἐξομολογήσασθαι αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ ὁ θεός}$, ὁ υἱός μεν , and 49. 3. ὁ θεός ἰμνησέσθαι , ὁ υἱός σου , and 70. 13. $\text{ὁ υἱός σου μακρῶς ἀπ' ἡμῶν}$, ὁ υἱός μεν . I dare not therefore say to any Person that he is ὁ υἱός μεν , except I doe believe that he is ὁ θεός . Wherefore I conclude that the words of S. Thomas, ὁ υἱός μεν , καὶ ὁ υἱός μεν , are as fully and highly significative, as those of David. $\text{Περίστασις τῆς ζωῆς διδόναι μεν}$, ὁ βασιλεὺς μεν , καὶ ὁ θεός μεν . Psal. 3. 2. or those, $\text{Ὁ θεός μεν καὶ ὁ υἱός μεν ἐκ τῶν δυνάμεων μεν}$, Psal. 35. 23. or those, $\text{Τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ υἱός μεν}$, $\text{ὁ βασιλεὺς μεν καὶ ὁ υἱός μεν}$. Psal. 84. 3. or those of S. Iohn in the Revelation, as they lie in the Alexandrian and Complutensian Copies. $\text{Ἄξιός ἐστι ὁ υἱός καὶ ὁ υἱός ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγαθός}$, &c. or that lastly in the most ancient Hymne, $\text{ὁ υἱός ὁ υἱός ὁ υἱός τῷ θεῷ... ἰδοὺ σου ἡμῶν}$.

for our Saviour replied, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed. And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord, and the God of an Apostle.

Nor have we onely their required testimony of Christs supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not onely termed *the God*, but, for a farther certainty, *the true God*: and the same Apostle who said the word was God, left any cavil should arise by any omission of an Article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate Authours, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, *we know*, saith he, *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true: even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.* As therefore we read in the Acts, of the *Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all*: where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun *he* joyned unto Jesus Christ, the immediate, not unto God, the remote antecedent: So likewise here *the true God*, is to be referred unto Christ, who stands next unto it; not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the Text, but at a distance. There is no reason alledged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but onely this, that in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when *another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred; the same referreth us not to Joseph, but to the King of Egypt.* Whereas, if nothing else can be objected, but a possibility in respect of the grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred, as the King of Egypt: for whatsoever the incongruity be in History, it makes no solecisme in the syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate Antecedent to which the Relative may properly be referr'd; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh; being this is rendred as a reason why *we are in him that is true*, by being *in his Son*, to wit, because that Son is *the true God*; being in the language of S. Iohn the constant title of our Saviour is eternal life; being all these reasons may be drawn out of the text it self, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; I

can

a 1 Iohn 5. 20.
θεός ἵστιν ὁ ἀληθινός
θεός καὶ ὁ υἱὸς
ἐκ τῆς αἰωνιότητος.
Hic agitur
non solum de
vero Deo, sed
de illo uno
vero Deo, ut
articulus in
Græco addi-
tus indicat.
Catech. Racov.
b Acts 10. 36.
* ἔτι for ἔτι.
as Acts 3. 26.
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
quæ est de-
ferta.
c Acts 7. 18,
19.

* Δεξαζα' Ιησθ
 χειρὸν τ' Θεῶν.
 Ignat. Epist.
 ad Smyrn.
 Ἐν θαλάμαῳ τῷ
 Πατρὸς, καὶ Ἰη-
 σοῦ χειρὸς τοῦ
 Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Id.
 Ep. ad Eph.

ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς
ἐκκυφορήθη ὑπὸ
Μαρίας. *ib.*
Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐκ
Πατρὸς αἰνῶν μὲλ-
λον φαίνεται.
Ep. ad Rom.

F 2

The third Assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, That the divine essence which Christ had, as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, That there can be but one essence properly divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and Majesty; that there can be but * one person originally of himself subsisting in that infinite being, because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not receiving his eternal being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, being we have already prov'd that he is truly and properly the eternal God, he must be understood to have the God-head communicated to him by the Father, who is not onely eternally, but originally God. ^a *All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine, saith Christ; because in him is the same fulness of the God-head, and more then that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the God-head not from the Son, nor any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father. Christ is the true God and eternal life; but that he is so, is from the Father: for ^b as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, not by participation, but by communication. 'Tis true, our Saviour was so in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equall with God: but when the Jewes sought to kill him because he ^c made himself equall with God, he answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; by that connexion of his operations, shewing the reception of his essence: and by the acknowledgement of his power, professing his substance from the Father. From whence he which was equall, even in that equality confesseth a priority, saying, ^{*} *The Father is greater then I.* The Son equall in respect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the Communication of the God-head. ^d *I know him, saith Christ; for I am from him.* And because he is from the Father, †therefore he is called by those of the Nicene Council in their Creed,*

dedit tibi Deus esse. S. Aug. & paulo post, Quid ergo filio dedit? dedit ei ut filius esset. Genuit ut vita esset, hoc est, dedit habere ei vitam in semetipso, ut esset vita non egens vita, ne participando intelligatur habere vitam. Si enim participando haberet vitam non in semetipso, posset & amittendo esse sine vita: hoc in filio ne accipias, ne cogites, ne credas. Manet ergo Pater vita, manet & Filius vita. Pater vita in semetipso, non à Filio; Filius vita in semetipso, sed à Patre. So again de Trinit. l. i. c. 12. Plerumque dicit, dedit mihi Pater, in quo vult intelligi quod eum genuerit Pater; non ut tanquam jam existentem & non habentem dederit aliquid, sed ipsum dedisse ut haberet, genuisse est ut esset, c. Iohn 5. 18, 19. Tanquam diceret, quid scandalizati estis quia Patrem meum dixi Deum, quia æqualem me facio Deo? Ita sum æqualis, ut non ille à me, sed ego ab illo sim. Hoc enim intelligitur in his verbis. Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, &c. hoc est, quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut possit, quia à Patre habet ut sit. Filio enim hoc est esse quod posse. S. Aug. in locum. paulo post, Hoc est, Non potest Filius à se quicquam facere, quod esset, si diceret, non est Filius à se. Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo natus est. * δὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐν τῷ μὲν ὅτι ἐστὶν αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ ὅτι ἐστὶν τῆς φύσεως. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio. † Iohn 7. 29. † So S. Aug. hath observed. Ab ipso, inquit, sum, quia Filius de Patre, & quicquid est filius, de illo est, cujus est filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo sed tantum Deum. Et dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, ab ipso sum. From hence then did the Nicene Council gather those words of their Creed, *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἀληθινοῦ* but not immediately, for they were partly in some of the Oriental Creeds before; as appeareth by that Confession which Eusebius presented to the Council, as con-

* Εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποστόλων, καὶ πατρὶος καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. S. Basil. Ep. 78. Εὐαγγελίου ὁ πατήρ. Alex. Epist. apud Theodoretum a Iohn 16. 15. Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, τὰ υἱὸς ἔσται, ὡς ἡμεῖς λαμβάνομεν τὸ υἱὸν πατρὸς. ἡ δὲ ἰσχυρία ἔσται καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ὁμιλῶντος, ἐκ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ πατρὸς.

S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio.

b Iohn 5. 26.

Hoc dixit, vitam dedit filio ut haberet eam in semetipso, tanquam diceret, pater qui est vita in semetipso, genuit filium qui esset vita in semetipso. Pro eo enim quod est genuit, voluit intelligi dedit, tanquam si cuiquam diceremus,

God

taining what he had believed and taught ever since his Baptisme, in which he had these words, καὶ εἰς τὴν κτί-
σιν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐκ κτίσεως, ζῶν ἐκ ζῶν. And as Eusebius calls him life of
life, so others power of power, and wisdom of wisdom. Ideo Christus virtus & sapientia Dei, quia de
Patre virtute & sapientia etiam ipse virtus & sapientia est, sicut lumen de Patre lumine, & fons vitæ
apud Deum Patrem utique fontem vitæ. S. Aug. de Trin. l. 7. c. 3. and not onely so, but essence of
essence. Pater & Filius simul una sapientia, quia una essentia; & singillatim sapientia de sapientia,
sicut essentia de essentia.

God of God, light of light, very God of very God. The Father is God, but not of God, light, but not of light; Christ is God, but of God, light, but of light. There is no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, because the same in both; but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself from none, Christ hath the same not of himself, but from him.

* ὁμοούσιος,
which is co-
essential or con-
substantial, is
not to be taken
of a part of the
divine essence,
as if the Son
were a part of
the essence of
the Father, and
so of the same
nature with
him, which
was the opi-

And being the divine nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it onely communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged * Coessential, of the same substance with the Father, as the Council of Nice determin'd, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him; *a I and the Father are one*: where the plurality of the verb, and the neutralitie of the noun, with the distinction of their persons speak a perfect identity of their essence. And though Christ say, *the Father is in me, and I in him*; yet withall he saith, *I came out from the Father*: by

nion of the Manichees. Οὐκ ὡς Οὐαληντίνος περὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον τὸ Πατρός· ἰδὲ ὡς Μανιχαίου· μὴ ὁμοούσιον τὸ Πατρός τὸ ὁμοούσιον εἰσαγόμενον. as Arrius in his Epistle to Alexander. By the interpretation of S. Hilary: Nec ut Valentini prolationem natum Patris commentatus est; nec, sicut Manichæus, patrem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit. de Trinit. l. 6. Quod Hilarius ita Latine reddidit, tanquam ὁμοούσιον id significaret, quod partem substantiæ habet ex toto resectam, says Dionys. Petavius, without any reason; for S. Hilary clearly translates ὁμοούσιον barely unius substantiæ, and it was in the Original μὴ ὁμοούσιον, which he expressed by partem unius substantiæ. Under this notion first the Arrians pretended to refuse the name ὁμοούσιον, as Arrius in the same Epistle signifieth, lest thereby they should admit a reall composition and division in the Deity. Εἰ τὸ ἐκ πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐγένετο, ὡς μὴ τὸ αὐτοῦ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὡς ὁμοούσιον ἀπὸ πρῶτον νοεῖται, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ δυνάμις, καὶ πνεῦμα. And S. Hierome testifies thus much not onely of Arrius and Eunomius, but also of Origen before them. Habetur Dialogus apud Græcos Origenis, & Candidi Valentinianæ Hæreseos defensoris. Quos duos Andabaras digladiantes spectasse me fateor. Dicit Candidus, Filium de Patris esse substantia, errans in eo quod περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν αἰρετῇ: E regione Origenes, juxta Arrium & Eunomium, repugnat eum vel prolatum esse vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes. Apol. 2. in Ruffin. And therefore Eusebius Bishop of Casarea refused not to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away. Τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὁμοούσιον πατρὶ αὐτῷ ἀναπαύοντι τῷ αὐτῷ ἐκ πατρὸς εἶναι, ὡς καὶ μὴ ὡς παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα. Upon this Confession he subscribed to that clause, begotten of the substance of the Father, which was not in his own Creed. And again, Οὐτὼ καὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τὸ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν. ἐκ πατρὸς ὡς ὁ λόγος συνέσθην ἐκ αὐτῶν συμπαύοντες πρὸς τοὺς θεοῦ ζῶντος παρακλητικούς, ὅτι καὶ κατὰ διαίρεσιν τῆς οὐσίας, ὅτι καὶ ἀποδομῶν, &c. Upon this acknowledgement he was persuaded to subscribe to the other clause also (added to that Creed which he himself gave in to the Council,) being of one substance with the Father: which clause was inserted by the Council, at the instance of Constantine the Emperour. Now as the Manichees made use of the word ὁμοούσιος to expresse their errors concerning the nature of God and the person of Christ; so the Ancient Fathers, before the Nicene Council, had used the same in a true Catholick sense to expresse the unity in essence of the Father and the Son; as appeareth by the confession of the same Eusebius, ὅτι καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν λόγιον· πνέας, καὶ ἀσώματος ὁμοούσιος, καὶ συσχεσθίας ἑνωμένης, ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας καὶ αὐτὸς θεολογίας τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας συσχεσθίας ὁμοούσιος. Wherefore the other Eusebius of Nicomedia, understanding the ancient Catholick sense, confessed that if they believed Christ to be the true begotten, and not created Son of God, they must acknowledge him ὁμοούσιον, which the Arrians endeavoured to make so odious; and therefore the Council in opposition to them determined it. Quid est aliud cur Homousion Patri nolint Filium dici, nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium? sicut Author ipsorum Eusebius Nicomedienensis Epistola sua prodidit, dicens, Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium, & increatum dicimus, Homousion cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta esset Epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in Tractatu fidei posuerunt Patres, quod id viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hæresis amputarent. S. Ambros. l. 3. de Fide, c. 7. De voco ὁμοούσιος, vide Dionys. Petav. de Trinit. l. 4. c. 6. a Iohn 10. 30.

the

the former shewing the divinity of his essence, by the later the origination of himself. We must not look upon the divine nature as *steril, but rather acknowledge and admire the fecundity, and communicability of it self, upon which the † creation of the world dependeth; God making all things by his Word, to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of our third Assertion, that the Father hath communicated the divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus, who is the Christ.

The fourth Assertion followeth, That the Communication of the divine essence by the Father, is the generation of the Son; and Christ, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the Father, is the eternal Son of God. That God alwayes had a Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the Proverbs of Solomon, *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Sons name, if thou canst tell?* And it was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew, it was not otherwise possible to preferre himself before our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater then another, and Mahomet might perswade his credulous disciples that he was greater then any of the sons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternal Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to preferre himself before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his * Alcoran, that God hath no such Son, nor any equall with him: and his disciples have † corrupted the Psalm of David, reading (in stead of *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*,) *Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee*. The later * Jews acknowledging the words and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so unto David, as that they deny them to belong to Christ, and that upon no other ground, then that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians Confession. But by the consent of the ancient Jewes, by the interpretation of the blessed Apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense, to him alone. *For, unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my Son, this day have I begot-*

* ἀδελφόν γὰρ τὸν θῆν εἰσὶν ἱεροὶ τῆς οὐρα καὶ γονιμότητος. Damasc. l. i. c. 8.

† Εἰ δὲ μὴ κατὰ τὸν ὅτι αὐτὴ ἡ θεία οὐσία, ἀλλ' ἱεροὶ κατὰ αὐτὴν, αἱ φῶς μὴ φανερὰ καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ πῶς διμυροῦνται ἐκείνην αὐτὴν ἔχον λόγον καὶ αἰσθητὸν ΔδS. Athan. Orat. 2.

* This is often repeated there, and particularly in the last chapter but one, called Alechilus. Est ipse Deus æternus, qui nec genuit, nec genitus est, & cui nullus est æqualis. And the Saracenicæ set forth by Sylburgius, mention this as the first principle of Mahometanism. * On εἰς θεὸς ἰστὶ πολυθεὶς ἢ δῶκε μὴτα

ἡμεῖς, μὴτα ἡμεῖς. And Ioannes Siculus and Georgius Cedrenus relate how Mahomet gave command, *Ἦνα μόνον προσκυνοῦν θῆν, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν μακάριον λέγοντα τὸ θεῖον αὐτῷ, ὃ καὶ οὐκ ἔστι.* And we read of his ridiculous History, that Christ, after his ascension into heaven, was accused by God for calling himself his Son; and that he denied it, as being so named onely by men without any authority from him. * On ἀποδείξαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁ θεός, λέγοντα, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οὗ εἶπεν τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν, ὅτι ὡς εἶπεν τὸ θεῖον καὶ θῆν καὶ ἀποδείξαι ἡμεῖς ὅτι καὶ εἶπεν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι καὶ ἀποδείξαι εἶπεν ὁ θεός. αὐτὸς οἱ ἀνθρώποι λέγουσιν ὅτι εἶπεν τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν. † Alfrizabadum in his Kamuz. Dictum Dei omnipotentis ad J-tum (cui propitius sit & pacem concedat Deus) Tu es Nabija, Propheta meus, ego Walladoca, fovi te; at dixerunt Christiani, Tu es Bonaya, filius meus, Ego Walladoca, te genui. Longe est supra hæc Deus. And to the same purpose Ebnol Athir. In Evangelio dixit Iſa, Ego Walladoca, i. e. educavi te; at Christiani dempta litera Lam altera, ipsum ei filium statuerunt. Qui longe elatus est super ea quæ dicunt. Whereas then the Apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahometans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messias, were forced to corrupt the Text; and for that they pretend the eminency and excellency of the Godhead, as if it were beneath the Majesty of God to beget a Son, or be a Father. And indeed whosoever would bring in another Prophet greater then Christ, as he was then Moses, must do so. * I say, the later Jews so attribute those words to David, as if they belonged not to the Messias: but the ancient Jews understood them of the Christ, as appeareth not onely out of those places in the Evangelists, where the Christ and the Son of God are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jews themselves, who have confessed no lesse. So Rabbi David Kimchi in the end of his Commentaries on the second Psalm, וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ. Some interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the anointed is Messias the King; and so our Doctours of happy memory have expounded it. And Rabbi Solomon Iarchi not onely confesseth that the Ancient Rabbins did interpret it of the Messias, but shews the reason why the later Jews understood it rather of David, that thereby they might the better answer the Argument of the Christians deduced from thence, וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְכִי יִשָּׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ. Our Doctours have expounded it of the Messias; but as to the literal sense, and for the answering Hereticks (that is, in their language, Christians) it is rather to be interpreted of David in his own person. a Heb. 1. 5.

ten thee, as the Apostle argues? and if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the Apostle's Argument had been none at all.

Now that the Communication of the divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear: because the most proper generation which we know, is nothing else but a vitall production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus Man begetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same humane nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of paternity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolificall benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply, Adam begat in his own likeness; after his image*: and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of humane generations hath been continued. This then is the known * confession of all men, that a Son is nothing but another produced by his Father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In humane generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internall nature, the other in reference to the externall form or figure. The former similitude is essentiall and necessary, it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the later accidentall, not onely sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. † The similitude then in which the propriety of generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this Communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word, is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence Christ is called *the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the expresse image of his person*.

Nor is this communication of the divine essence onely the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it farre more proper then any naturall generation of the Creature, not onely because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below; so in the communication, we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In humane generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the Father, which is performed by derivation, or decission of part of the substance of the parent: but this decission includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal, whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decission, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the Father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger then himself: for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality, wholly to be removed when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being al-

ways

Gen. 1. 29.
5. 3.

* Καὶ οὗτοι ὁμολογοῦντες ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρί, καὶ ὁμογενὴς αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁμοιότητος αὐτοῦ ἐκγεγεννημένος, καὶ ὁμοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὢν.

Epist. 1. This is in the language of Aristotle, καὶ ὁμοούσιος αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁμογενὴς αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁμοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὢν.

And S. Basil. 1. 2. contra Eunomium. καὶ ὁμοούσιος αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁμογενὴς αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁμοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὢν.

† Etiamli filius hominis homo, in quibusdam similitis, in quibusdam sit dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est, negari verus filius non potest, & quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substantiæ non potest. Saint Aug. contra Maximin. c. 13. a 2 Cor. 4. 4 Heb. 1. 3.

† The Socinians make very much of this Notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternal generation. So the Racovian Catechisme : Causa cur Christo ista attributa (sc. proprium & unigenitum Dei Filium esse) competent, hæc est; quod inter omnes Dei filios & præcipuus sit, & Deo charissimus : quem admodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus, & hæres extitit, unigenitus vocatus est, Heb. 11. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; & Solomon unigenitus coram matre sua, licet

plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint. 1 Paral. 3. 1, 2, 3, & c. And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schliisingius hath inserted it as a material observation; Nam hic unicus seu unigena filius nominatur, qui cæteris longe charior est Patri, longeque præstantior; and confirms the Interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this Observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the Son of God, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived; then he is the only begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the only begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their Parents. Or if Christ were the Only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this Interpretation was invented, that, when all the rest should fail, they might stick to this. a Gen. 18. 14. 21. 12. b Heb. 11. 17. * Eunomius would have it only $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in relation to the Father only. S. Basil shews that no way proper, and shews that $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is not he which $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, but $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$. S. Cyril adds these two $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ together, in relation to the Father and the Son, $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \phi\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\ \epsilon\kappa\ \delta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. Epist. 1. ad Regim. as Rufinus doth in Unicus. Ideo subiungit Unicum hunc esse Filium Dei, Unus enim de uno nascitur. Expos. Symb. S. Gregory Naz. adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner. $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \epsilon\chi\ \delta\tau\iota\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\lambda\lambda\ \delta\tau\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\epsilon\chi\ \alpha\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha$. So he something obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen. $\Delta\iota\gamma\alpha\ \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\tau\iota\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\lambda\lambda\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

love

Having thus declared the interpretation of the word, that properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exelution; and that none can be strictly called the *Only-begotten*, but he who alone was so begotten; we shall proceed to make good our Assertion, shewing that the divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, & that we call the same God *our Father* which Christ called his; that *both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren*: we confesse that those whom S. Paul *hath begotten through the Gospel*, may well be term'd the *begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them*: but withall we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the Generation of the Son. We are first † generated, and have our naturall being; after that regenerated, and so receive a spirituall renovation, and by vertue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the Generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of Adoption, shewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphorically: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the naturall Son of God, that his * generation clearly excludeth the name of Adoption.

1 Cor. 4. 15.
 ἐγὼ Χριστὸς
 Ἰησοῦ διὰ τῆς ἀ-
 γαπῆς ἐγὼ ὁ
 μὲς ὑμῶν.
 1 Ioh. 3. 9.
 πᾶς ὁ ἠγαπῶν τὴν
 ἀμαρτίαν ἐ-
 στί, ὅτι σὴν-
 μα αὐτοῦ ἐστί
 τὸ μῆναι. And
 more expressly
 1 Ioh. 5. 1.
 Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων
 ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ

V. 3

tion;

man Christ Iesum is no other person then the Word, who is the eternal and natural Son, and by subsisting in the humane nature could not leave off to be the natural Son. The denial of this by Felix and Elipandus was condemned as Heretical in the Council of Frankford; and their Opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of S. Augustine, partly in their own additions. *Confitemur & credimus eum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, non genere esse filium Dei, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratia.* This they maintained by forged testimonies of some Fathers, and by the Liturgy of the Church of Toledo, composed by Hildephonsus, as the Roman by Gregory. In the Masse de Cæna Domini, Qui per adoptivi hominis passionem, dum suo non indulsit corpori. And in the Masse de Ascensione Domini, Hodie Salvator noster per adoptionem carnis, sedem repetivit Deitatis. To this the Synod opposed their determination in Sacrosyllabo. Quod ex te nascetur sanctum vocabitur filius Dei, non adoptivus, sed verus, non alienus, sed proprius. And again, Porro adoptivus dici non potest qui alienus est ab eo à quo dicitur adoptatus: & gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio præstat: sicut nos aliquando cum essemus peccando filii iræ, alieni eramus à Deo, per proprium & verum Filium qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est. And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodic Epistle. Unitas personæ quæ est in Dei filio & filio Virginis, adoptionis tollit injuriam.

Gal. 4. 4. 5.

*Legi & re-
gi Scripturas,
Iesum filium
Dei nusquam
adoptione
inveni. Am-
brosius Ep. ad Rom.
Dices mihi,
Cur times a-
doptivum
Christum
Dominum
nominare?
Dico tibi,
quia nec A-
postoli eum
sic nomina-
runt, nec san-
cta Dei &
Catholica
Ecclesia con-
suetudinem
habuit sic

eum appellare. Synod. Epist. concil. Francoford. From whence they charge all those to whom they write that Synodic Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures, Intel-
ligite, Fratres, quæ legitis, & nolite nova & incognita nomina fingere; sed quæ in S. Scriptura inven-
iuntur, tenere, &c. † S. Aug. hath observed, that S. Paul made use of *υιοθεσία*, that he might distinguish
the filiation of Christ from ours. At vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de
natura atque substantia sua non nos genuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utrique dilectione adoptavit.
Quo verbo Apostolus sæpe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, nisi ad discernendum Unigenitum. De
consens. Evang. l. 2. c. 3. And S. Ambrose takes notice, that the name of true destroyeth that of adopted.
Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium esse natura, sed eum dicimus natura esse filium, qui verus est fi-
lius. De Incarn. Sac. c. 8. * Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus, dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaq;
de multis non potest dici. Concil. Francof. Quod si etiam Unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia,
non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen & veritatem Unigeniti perdidit, postquam fratres ha-
bere jam cœpit: privatur enim hujus veritate nominis, si in Unigenito non est de Patre veritas natu-
ralis. Fulgentius ad Thrasim. l. 3. c. 3. Si divina illa Filii sempiternaque nativitas, non de natura
Dei Patris, sed ex gratia creditur substituisse, non debet Unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genitus.
Quoniam sicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternæ contribuit sic eum ab Unigeniti nomine
nobis quoque tributa communio paternæ adoptionis excludit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quam-
vis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis. Ib. c. 4.

third

third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word, by that communication of the divine essence, become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the son of God, how is the Word the *only Son*? To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father, which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession: and though * every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the † Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever call'd the Son, but the gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the Son of Adam: and this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; Eve descending not from Adam, as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by naturall fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same Person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the Regeneration and Adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternall generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a reall being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception, was not any created, but the one and indivisible divine essence; seeing he had not that divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated † unto any, we must also acknowledge him the *Only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son, from the Adopted children, as the Naturall Son.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and naturall Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation, the *Only Son*, appeareth first in the confirmation of our Faith concerning the Redemption of mankind. For this doth shew such an excellency and dignitie in the person of the Mediatour, as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his sufferings. We know it ^a is not possible that the blood of bulls & goats should take away sins: and we may very well doubt, how the blood of him who hath

† Spiritus S. innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre. *Isaac. lib. Fidei.* Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus S. est, qui à Patre & Filio procedit. *S. Ambr. in Symb.* † *ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἵδμεν, φωνήσας ἑαυτοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα:* αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐγενήθη. *S. Basil Hom. de Fide.* ^a *Heb. 10. 4.*

* Non omne id quod procedit, nascitur, sicut omne id quod nascitur procedat. *S. Aug. contra Max.*

† 3. c. 14. who gives the same solution to the same Argument. Quæris à me, si de substantia

Patris est Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus filius sit, & alius non sit filius? Ego respon-

deo, five capias, five non capias; De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus S. sed ille genitus est, ille procedens.

† Nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo Filius natus, à quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est filius. *Gennad. De Eccles. Dog. Deus Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo. Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre, Spiritus*

1 Cor. 6. 20.

7, 23.

1 Pet. 1. 19.

Acts 20. 28.

Heb. 9. 14.

no other nature then that of man, can take away the sins of other men; there appearing no such difference as will shew a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be *bought with a price*, well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently *precious*, when we are assured that it is the *blood of God*: nor can we question the efficacy of it in purging *our conscience from dead works*, if we believe Christ *offered up himself through the eternall spirit*. If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignitie of the partie offended in respect of the offender; because the more worthie any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injurie tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion, and therefore every offence committed against him, must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injurie. Again, as the gravitie of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended, so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignitie of the person satisfying; because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injurie was eclipsed; and all honour doth encrease proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminencie, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation, be of the same infinite dignitie, so as the honour rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence, and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied, then by a belief in such a Mediatour as is the *Onely-begotten Son* of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignitie with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

John 5. 23.

Rev. 5. 13.

aDeu. 6. 13, 4.

† The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely *שרבי* & serves ei, but *שרבי ושרבי* & ipse servies. with such a peculiar restriction, as is expressed by the Chaldee Paraph. *שרבי וקראמי* & in conspectu ejus servies, by the LXX. *καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις*, and that restriction approved by our Saviour, *Matth. 4. 10.* * *Moses Maim. Prafat. in Seder Zeraim.*

Secondly, The belief of the eternall generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian, in ascribing that honour and glory unto Christ, which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son, which is truly and properly divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who *hath committed all judgement unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*. As it was represented to S. John in a vision, when he heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, saying, *Blessing, honour, glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lambe, for ever and ever*. Again, we are commanded *to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him*; and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because the Lord our God is one Lord. From whence, if any one arose among the Jewes, teaching under the title of a Prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgement of the * Rabbins was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as Moses wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that One God onely must be worshipt, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon

this

this precept as valid onely under the Law, as if then there were onely one God to be worshipt, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, ^a *Get thee hence Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve.* If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel onely; if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son, which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. When the Scripture bringeth in the first begotten into the world, it saith, *Let all the Angels of God worship him;* but then the same Scripture calleth that first begotten *Jehovah, and the Lord of the whole earth.* For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and grosse Idolatry; to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not the same degree, but the same sin; to worship him as God, who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be thought an act in the formality, void of Idolatry. Lest therefore, while we are all oblig'd to give unto him divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhorre, it is no lesse necessary, that we should believe that Son to be that eternall God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom onely we should serve.

^a Mat. 4. 10.

Heb. 1. 6.

Isa. 97. 6, 7.

Thirdly, our belief in Christ, as the eternall Son of God, is necessary to raise us unto a thankfull acknowledgement of the infinite love of God appearing in the sending of his onely-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extoll'd and admired by the Apostles. *God so loved the world,* saith S. John, *that he gave his onely begotten Son.* *God commendeth his love towards us,* saith S. Paul, *in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us; in that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.* In this, saith S. John again, *was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his onely-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.* Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. If we look upon all this as nothing else, but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner then other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortall man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of his love this way of redemption, more then would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. 'Tis true indeed that the reparation of lapsed man, is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation; considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happinesse to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God even in the act of Redemption it self; but yet the Apostles have rais'd that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God, in the chusing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation; by sending his *onely-begotten* into the world; by not sparing his own Son, by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of Gods love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignitie of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension to such a suffering condition; and the nearer his relation

John 3. 16.

Rom. 5, 8.

8, 32.

1 Joh. 4. 9, 10.

tion to the Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the Person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so farre to undervalue the love of God, and consequently, to come short of that acknowledgement and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world, were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignitie of nature in the person sent; then it is absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the *only begotten Son* of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of Majesty coeternal.

By this discourse in way of explication, every Christian may understand what it is he sayes, and expresse his mind how he would be understood when he maketh this brief confession, I believe in Christ *the only Son* of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no lesse then this: I do professe to be fully assured of this Assertion, as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ the Saviour and Messias is the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, *God of God, light of light, very God of very God*. And as I assert him so to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kinde of Sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation, and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation, all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so only by adoption, as 'tis natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his *Only Son*.

OUR LORD.

† For though in the first Rules of faith mentioned by Irenaeus and Tertullian we finde not Dominum nostrum, yet in all the Creeds afterward we finde those words; probably inserted because denied by the Valentinians, of whom Irenaeus. Δια τούτου τὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα

After our Saviour's Relation founded upon his eternal generation followeth his Dominion † in all ancient Creeds, as the necessary consequent of his Filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be *our Lord*, because the only Son must of necessity be Heir and Lord of all in his Father's house, and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or Angels, if compar'd to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of Christ.

Three things are necessary, and more cannot be, for a plenary explication of this part of the Article; first, the proper notation of the word *Lord* in the Scripture phrase, or language of the Holy Ghost; secondly, the full signification of the same in the adequate latitude of the sense, as it belongs to Christ; thirdly the application of it to the person making confession of his faith, and all others whom he involves in the same condition with himself, as saying not my, nor their, but *Our Lord*.

First then we must observe, that not only Christ is *the Lord*, but

that

that this title doth so properly belong unto him, that *the Lord* alone absolutely taken is † frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles determinately for Christ, insomuch that the Angels observe that dialect, * *Come see the place where the Lord lay*. Now for the true Notation of the word, it will † not be so necessary to enquire into the use or origination of the Greek, much lesse into the Etymology of the correspondent Latine, as to search into the Notion of the Jews, and the language of the Scriptures, according unto which the Evangelists and Apostles spake and wrote. And first, it cannot be denied, but that the word which we translate *the Lord* was used by the Interpreters of the Old Testament sometimes for * men, with no relation unto any other then humane dominion. And as it was by the Translatours of the Old, so is it also by the Pen-men of the † New. But it is most certain that Christ is called *Lord* in another notion then that which signifies any kind of humane dominion, because as so, *there are many Lords*, but He is in that notion, *Lord*, which admits of

† Mar 16. 19,
20. Lake 12,
42. 24, 34.
Ioh. 4. 1. 6. 23.
11. 2. 20. 2. 18,
20. 25. 21. 7.
Act. 9. 1. 6. 10,
11. 15. 17. 27.
3 I. 4. 2. 11. 16,
24. 13. 47. &c.
Kύριος.
* Matth. 28. 6.
† For whosoever shall consider the signification of Kύριος in the Scriptures, I

think will scarce find any footsteps of it in the ancient Greeks. In our Sacred Writ it is the frequent name of God, whereas I imagine it is not to be found so used by any of the old Greek Authors. Iulius Pollux, whose businessse is to observe what words and phrases may be properly made use of in that language, tells us the Gods may be called Θεοὶ or Δαίμονες, but Κύριος is neither proper, nor any name of God with them at all. Nor did they anciently use it in their OEconomicks, where their constant terms were not Κύριος, but Δεσπότης and δέσπο, and they had then another kind of notion of it, as appears by the complaint of the servant in Aristophanes; Τὸ Κύριον γὰρ ἐν ἡμῶν ὡς ἐν Κελεύει ὁ δούλος, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἰωνάδιον. In which words, if they were interpreted by the Scripture usage, Κύριος would signifie the Master, and ἰωνάδιον the person bought, that is the servant; whereas the place requires an interpretation wholly contrary: for ἰωνάδιον is not here ἰωνάδιον, but ἀπεχσας, or ἀνομιλῶν, as the Scholiast, Suidas, and Moschopolus have observed, that is, not the servant, but the Master who bought him. And though those Grammarians bring no other place to prove this active signification beside this of Aristophanes, by which means it might be still questionable whether they had rightly interpreted him without any authority, yet Phrynichus will sufficiently secure us of this sense. Εὐγεν ἰωνύηος οἰκίας ἀπέστειλε. ἐπαύσατο ἰδὲν ἰγροπέτῃ δὲ δὸτ τὴν πελάδα. μὲν τὸ ἰωνύηος δούλου. Εὐγενῆ then here is he which buyeth, that is, the Master, and consequently κύριος not the master, but the servant bought, whom he supposeth originally to have power over his own body. Indeed it was not onely distinguished, but in a manner opposed to Δεσπότης, as appears by that observation of Ammonius thus delivered by Eustathius in Odyss. 2. Κύριος γυναικὸς καὶ υἱὸν ἀνὴρ καὶ πατήρ, Δεσπότης δ' ἀγγελοποιῶν. * As ἱρκ is generally translated κύριος, when it signifieth Lord or Master in respect of a servant or inferiour. So Sarah called her husband, Gen. 18. 12. 1 Pet. 3. 6. so Eleazer his master, Abraham, Gen. 24. frequently. Thus Rachel saluteth her Father Laban, Gen. 31. 35. and Jacob his brother Esau, Gen. 33. 8. Potiphar is the κύριος of Ioseph whom he bought, Gen. 32. 2. &c. and Ioseph in power is so saluted by his brethren, Gen. 42. 10. and acknowledged by his servant, 44. 5. the general name in the law of Moses for servant and Master is παῖς and κύριος, Exod. 21. 2, 4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signifie no more then humane power, that we find אדני the name of man so translated, as 1 Sam. 17. 32. אדני דל יד יאקוב. καὶ διδύμου πρὸς τὸν αἰνῶνα. καὶ κύριος με ἐστὶν αὐτόν. † For κύριος is used with relation; and in opposition to παιδίσκος Acts 16. 16. in the sense which the later, not the ancient Greeks used it. Παιδίσκος, τὸν οὗτο δέσποινος οἱ νῦν πᾶσι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οὗτο τὸν καλῶν, as Phrynichus observes. As it is opposed to οἰκίτης Luke 16. 13. (according to that of Etymol. Κύριος ἦν ὁ οἰκίτης, ἔχει δ' ὁ οἰκίτης τὸν οἰκίτην.) to δούλος, Matth. 10. 24. 18. 25, &c. And in the Apostolical rules pertaining to Christian OEconomicks, the master and servant are δέσπο and κύριος. As also by way of addition κύριος τὸν δεσποῦ, Mat. 9. 38. κύριος τὸν ἀμπελῶν, Matth. 20. 8. κύριος τῆς οἰκίας, Mark 13. 35. Insomach as κύριος is sometimes used by way of address or salutation of one man to another, (as it is now generally among the later Greeks, and as Dominus was anciently among the Latines, Quomodo obvis, si nomen non occurrat, Dominos salutamus. Sen.) not onely of servants to masters, as Matth. 13. 27. or sons to parents, as Matth. 21. 30. or inferiours to men in authority, as Matth. 27. 63. but of strangers, as when the Greeks spake to Philip, and desired him saying, Κύριε, θέλωμεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν, Iohn 12. 21. and Mary Magdalene speaking unto Christ, but taking him for a gardener, Κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἔσθαι αὐτόν. Iohn 20. 15. And it cannot be denied but this title was sometimes given to our Saviour himself, in no higher or other sense then this; As when the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him then that he appeared to be one of the Jews, she said, Κύριε, ἀνταμα ἐκ ἔχουσ, καὶ τὸ φέας ἐστὶ βεβῶ. Iohn 4. 11. And the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him, Κύριε, ἀνέπαυον ἐκ ἔχω. Iohn 5. 7. The blind man to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith, Τίς ἐστὶς Κύριε; and πάλιν Κύριε, Iohn 9. 36, 38. a 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. b Eph. 4. 5.

καρπῆς, for εἰς, ἡμετέριον; καρπῆς, for ἡμετέριον, εἰρηκός καρπῆς, for εἰρηκός; and in Euripides ἔχον καρπῆς, for ἔχει, εἰσ-
 βάλλου καρπῆς, for εἰσβάλλει, ἡμετέριον καρπῆς, for ἡμετέριον, or ἀδελφῆς, as the Scholiast. From all which it unde-
 niably appeareth, that the ancient signification of καρπῆς or καρπῆς is the same with εἰμι or ἐπάγω, sum, I am, and
 therefore καρπῆς immediately derived from thence must be ὁ ἀν, or ὁ ἐπάγωγος; and consequently the proper
 interpretation of ἡνὶ descending from the root ἡν of the same signification. And well may we conceive the
 LXX for this reason to have so translated it, because we find the origination delivered by them in that notion,
 rendring ἡνὶ ὁ ἀν Ex. 3. 14. ἰζώ εἰμι ὁ ὄν, and again, ὁ ὄν ἀνίσταται με τοῦτο ὑπὸς. From whence consid-
 ering the name ἡν proceeding from that root, and given in relation to that sense, they made use of the word
 καρπῆς for the standing interpretation of that name, as being equivalent to ὁ ὄν. We have no reason then to
 conceive either that they so translated it out of the superstition of the Jews, (as some would persuade us, whom
 we have already refuted) or because they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could expresse
 the Hebrew name, whereas we find it often expressed even among the Gentile Greeks; but because they thought
 the Greek καρπῆς to be a proper interpretation, because reducible to the same signification. For even they
 which are pretended to have read Adonai for Jehovah, as Origen, &c. do acknowledge that the Heathens and
 the ancient Hereticks descending from the Jews, had a name by which they did expresse the Hebrew Jehovah.
 We know that Oracle preserved by Macrobius, Saturnal. l. i. c. 18. Θεὸς ὅν πάντες ὠνόμαζον Δεῖν ἡμῶν ἱαδῶν.
 and Didorus hath taught us from whence that name first came, mentioning Moses in this manner, παρὲς ὃ
 τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσὴν τὸν ἱαδῶν ὀνομαζόμενον Δεῖν. and Theodoret more expressly, Quest. 15. in Exod. Καλεῖται
 αὐτὸ Σαμαρείτης ἡμῶν ἱαδῶν, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ ἱαδῶν. Tophyr 1. 4. contra Christianos tells us Sanchoniathon had his rela-
 tions of the Jews παρὲς ἱεγυμῶν ὡς ἱεγυμῶν Δεῖν, ὡς ἱαδῶν. Eusebius (as we formerly mentioned) said ἱαδῶν
 ἱαδῶν ὀνομαζόμενα. Hesychius, ἱαδῶν μὲν ἱαδῶν ὀνομαζόμενα, taking ἱαδῶν in composition for the contraction of ἱαδῶν. As ἱανὸς
 ἱεγυμῶν ὀνομαζόμενος τὸν ὄν. And the LXX Jer. 23. 6. have rendred ὑπὲρ ἡν ἱαδῶν, id est Dominus Iustus,
 saith S. Hierome. And as the Heathens and the first Christians, so the Hereticks had among them the pronun-
 ciation and expression of the name ἡν. As the Valentinian was baptized ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ ἱαδῶν. Iren. l. i.
 and the Ophiani had their several Gods among the rest, ὡς μὲν μαγείας τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν, καὶ τὸν ἀστρονομίαν, καὶ
 τὸν ἀέρος, ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν ἱεγυμῶν γαρὶν τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν ἱεγυμῶν ὀνομαζόμενος. Orig. contra Celsum l. 6. So
 I read it, not as it is in the Edition of Heselinius, ἱαδῶν ἱονε word, or ἱαδῶν, as our learned Countryman Ni-
 colaus Fullerus hath endeavoured in vain to rectifie it, but ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν, that is, the Ophiani took the name ἱαδῶν
 from the Jews, among whom it signifies the same who is called Iah. For that it ought so to be read, appeareth
 by the former words of Origen, Οἱοντὶ τὸν δυνάστα τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν καὶ ἱεγυμῶν ὡς τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν. Ὡς δὲ
 καὶ τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν ὡς καὶ τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν ὡς τὸν ἱαδῶν ἱαδῶν. In the printed copy indeed it is ἱαδῶν, and in
 the Latine Iadin, but without sense; whereas dividing the words, the sense is manifest, and the reason of the
 former emendation apparent. Being then there were so many among the Greeks which did in all ages expresse
 the Hebrew name, it can be no way probable that the LXX should avoid it as inexpressible in their language.

Being then this title *Lord* thus signifieth the proper name of God
Jehovah, being the same is certainly attributed unto Christ, in a no-
 tion farre surpassing all other Lords, which are rather to be looked
 upon as servants unto him, it will be worth our enquiry next whe-
 ther, as it is the Translation of the name *Jehovah*, it belong to
 Christ; or whether, though he be Lord of all other Lords, as sub-
 jected under his authority, yet he be so inferiour unto him whose
 name alone is *Jehovah*, as that in that propriety and eminency in
 which it belongs unto the supreme God, it may not be attributed
 unto Christ.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the name *Jehovah*
 it self to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to ac-
 knowledge the originall name, and to deny the interpretation in the
 sense and full importance of that originall. Wherefore if Christ be
 the *Jehovah*, as so called by the Spirit of God, then is he so the *Lord*,
 in the same propriety and eminency in which *Jehovah* is. Now what-
 soever did belong to the Messias, that may and must be attributed
 unto Jesus, as being the true and onely Christ. But the Jewes
 themselves acknowledge that *Jehovah* shall be known clearly in the
 dayes of the Messias, and not onely so but that it is the * name which
 properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confesse so
 much, who onely read the propheties as the Eunuch did, without
 an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a
 truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infal-
 lible interpretation of them? If they could see *Jehovah the Lord of*
hosts

* As Midrash,
 Tillim on 21.
 Psal. Echa Ra-
 bari Lam. 1. 6.

hosts to be the name of the Messias, who was to them for a stone of a Rom. 9.33. stumbling and rock of offence, how can we possibly be ignorant of it, b Hof. 1. 7. who are taught by S. Paul, that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, where it is further observable that the as it is written, ^a Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed? It was no other chalde Paraphrase hath then Jehovah who spake those words, ^b I will have mercy upon the house בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל for of Iudah, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will בְּיָדוֹ by not save them by bow nor sword. Where not only he who is described the word of as the originall and principall cause, that is, the Father who gave Jehovah for his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, Jehovah. and that in opposition to all other means or instrumentall causes, is call'd Jehovah; who can be no other then our Jesus, because there is Acts 4. 12. no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved. As in another place he speaketh, I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah) and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord (Jehovah); where he which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personal pronoun, and yet each of them is Jehovah, and Jehovah our Zech. 10. 14. God is one Jehovah. Whatsoever † objections may be fram'd against

Deut. 6. 4:

† Two Adversaries we have

to the exposition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; onely with this difference, that we find the lesse opposition from the Jew, from whom indeed we have so ample a concession as will destroy the others contradiction. First Socinus answers, the name belongeth not to Christ but unto Israel; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same Prophet, Jer. 33. 15, 16. Socin. refut. Tac. Wieki. cap. 6. Catech. Racov. de Pers. Christi, c. 1. Crell. de Deo & Attr. l. 1. c. 11. To this we first oppose the constant interpretation of the Jews, who attribute the name Jehovah to the Messias from this one particular Text. As in the Sepher Ikharim. l. 2. c. 8. וְקָרָא הַנְּתִיב שֵׁם הַמָּשִׁיחַ יְהוָה. The Scripture called the name of the Messias Jehovah our righteousness. And in Midrash Tillim. on Psal. 21. וְקָרָא לְמֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ בְּשֵׁם וְזִמְרוֹ שֵׁם יְהוָה אֵשׁ יְהוָה אֵשׁ. God calleth the Messias by his own name, and his name is Jehovah, as it is said (Exod. 15. 2.) The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messias, (Jer. 23. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. Thus Echa Rabati. Lam. 1. 6. וְקָרָא יְהוָה אֵשׁ יְהוָה אֵשׁ. אָמֵן יְהוָה שֵׁם יְהוָה שֵׁם יְהוָה אֵשׁ יְהוָה אֵשׁ. What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name. As it is said, (Jer. 23. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. The Rabbins then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literal importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name Jehovah did belong to the Messias. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to inforce the same interpretation. For whereas in the 23. 6. of Jeremiah it is expressly said, שֵׁם יְהוָה אֵשׁ, this is the name, in the 33. it is onely יְהוָה without any mention of a name; and surely that place cannot prove Jehovah to be the name of Israel, which speaks not one word of the name of Jerusalem; for where we read in Crellius, hoc scilicet nomen est, all but hoc is not Scripture, but the glosse of Crellius, and hoc it self cannot be warranted for the interpretation of יְהוָה, nor quo for אֵשׁ; the simplest interpretation of those words יְהוָה אֵשׁ, being ille qui vocabitur ams, he which calleth Jerusalem is the Lord our righteousness, that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid, which he easily foreseeing, bath joyned with the Jewish Rabbins in the second answer, admitting that Jehovah our righteousness is the name of the Messias, but withal denying that the Christ is that Jehovah. To which purpose they assert those words, Jehovah our righteousness, to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition; and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to inferre as much. As Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah nissi. Exod. 17. 15. Gideon built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah Shalom. Judg. 6. 24. And the name of the City in the last words of Ezekiel is Jehovah Shammah. In all which places it is most certain that the Jehovah is not predicated of that of whose name it is a part; but is the subject of a proposition, given by way of nomination, whose verb substantive or copula is understood. But from thence to conclude, that the Lord our righteousness can be no otherwise understood of Christ then as a Proposition, and that we by calling him so according to the Prophets predication, can understand no more thereby then that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For first, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a Proposition of themselves, because Jehovah cannot be the predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent that an Altar or a City built cannot be God: and whatsoever is not Jehovah without addition, cannot be Jehovah with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given; and our Adversaries who teach, that the name Jehovah is sometimes given to the Angels representing God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ whom they confesse to be

us,

above all Angels, and far more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, that which is the addition in those names, cannot be truly predicated of that thing which bears the name. Moses could not say that *Altar* was his exaltation, nor *Gideon* that it was his peace; and if it could not so be predicated by itself, it could neither be by apposition, and consequently, even in this respect, it was necessary to make the name a Proposition. But our righteousness may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of the Lord our righteousness, for the Apostle hath expressly taught us that he is made righteousness unto us. 1 Cor. 1. 30. and if it may be in itself, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly, that addition of our righteousness doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person called *Iehovah* but to that Christ alone. For he alone is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Rom. 10. 4. and when he is said to be made unto us righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30. he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being then Christ is thus peculiarly called our righteousness under the Gospel, being the place of the Prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the Gospel, being no other person called *Iehovah* is ever expressly called our righteousness in the Gospel; it followeth not only that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be fulfilled, then by acknowledging that Christ is the Lord our righteousness: and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both *Iehovah* and our righteousness, he is as truly *Iehovah* as our righteousness.

Jer. 23. 6. us, we know Christ is the righteous branch raised unto David; the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose dayes *Iudah* shall be saved, and *Israel* shall dwell safely; we are assured that this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness, the Lord, that is, *Iehovah*, the expression of his supremacy: and the addition of Our righteousness can be no diminution to his Majesty. If those words in the Prophet, Sing and rejoyce, O daughter of *Sion*, for lo I come, and I dwell in the midst of thee saith the Lord (*Iehovah*;) did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much: And many nations shall be joyned to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee; for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

And as the original *Iehovah* was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets, so the title of Lord, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signal prediction of the first age of the Gospel, God promised by *Joel*, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (*Iehovah*) shall be deliver'd; and S. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed, and inferring from that, if we confesse with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved. For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed; and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved; then must the Lord in the thirteenth verse of the tenth Chapter to the Romans, be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse, or else S. Pauls Argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises. But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other then *Iehovah*, as appeareth by the Prophet *Joel* from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of *Iehovah*.

If we consider the office of John the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know it was he of whom it is written in the Prophet *Malachi*, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; we are sure he which spake those words, was (*Iehovah*) the Lord of hosts, and we are as sure

Mat. 11. 10.

Malach. 3. 1.

Joel 2. 32.

Rom. 10. 9.

11. 13.

a Matth. 3. 3.
b Luke 1. 76.
* I say there-
fore undenia-
bly, because it
is not only the
undoubted

Nor

Psal. 110. 1.

† Chal. Pa-
raph.Malac. 3.
מלאכי

Nor is this the onely Notation of the name or title *Lord*, taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all mere humane power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name *Jehovah*, so is it also for that of *Adon* or *Adonai*. *The Lord said unto my Lord*, saith David, that is in the original, *Jehovah* unto *Adon*, and that *Adon* is the † *Word*, that *Lord* is Christ. We know the Temple at Jerusalem was the Temple of the most High God, and the *Lord* of that Temple in the emphasis of an Hebrew Article was Christ, as appeareth by that Prophet. *The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his Temple even the messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in.*

Now this Notation, as it is the interpretation of *Adon*, signifieth immediately and properly *dominion* implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not onely agree with that other notion of *Jehovah*, but presupposeth it, as following and flowing from it. For He who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself; must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all. Because every thing must necessarily belong to him, from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being Christ is the *Lord*, as that title is taken for *Jehovah*, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence, and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth that he be acknowledged also the *Lord*, as that name expresseth *Adon*, signifying power authoritative, and proper dominion. Thus having explained the Notation of the word *Lord*, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition, we come next to the second, which is to declare the nature of this Dominion, and to shew, how, and in what respect Christ is the *Lord*.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the Dominion seated or invested in Christ as the *Lord*, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his Divinity, the other bestowed upon his Humanity; one, by which he is the *Lord* the maker of all things, the other, by which he is made *Lord* of all things.

John 1. 1. 3.

As for the first, we are assured, that the *Word was God*, that by the same Word *all things were made; & without him was not any thing made that was made*; we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the creatour of all things, must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creatour who made all things. Therefore the *Word*, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universall dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting but believing Thomas, *My Lord, and my God.*

John 20. 28.

As for the Second, it is also certain that there was some kind of Lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very unction proves no lesse then an imparted dominion: as S. Peter tells us, that he was *made both Lord and Christ*. What David spake of man, the Apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, *thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands, thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.*

Acts 2. 36.

Heb. 2. 7, 8.

Now a Dominion thus imparted, given, derived, or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God, as God, founded in the divine nature, because whatsoever is such, is absolute and independent. Wherefore
this

this Lord-ship thus imparted or acquired; appertaineth to the humane nature, and belongeth to our Saviour, as the Son of man. The right of judicature is part of this power, and Christ himself hath told us, that the Father *hath given him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of man*; and by virtue of this delegated authority; the *Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels, and reward every man according to his works*. Part of the same Dominion is the power of forgiving sins, as pardoning, no lesse then punishing; is a branch of the supreme Magistracy; and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy; *thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins*. Another branch of that power is the alteration of the law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter, which is to make a law; and Christ asserted himself to be *greater then the Temple*, shewing that *the Son of man was Lord even of the Sabbath day*.

John 5. 27.

Matth. 16. 27.

Matth. 9. 2, 6.

Matth. 12. 8.

This Dominion thus given unto Christ in his humane nature, was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true, *that Jesus knew, before his death; that the Father had given all things into his hands*, yet it is observable that in the same place it is written that he likewise knew *that he was come from God, and went to God*, and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not onely so, but also to reward him. For to *this end Christ both died, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*. After his resurrection he said to the Disciples, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*. He *drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head*. Because he *humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse*, Therefore God hath also *highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confesse that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*. Thus for and after his death, he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of man, but exalted by the Father, *who raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the heavenly places, farre above all principalitie, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not onely in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church*.

John 13. 3.

Rom. 14. 9.

Mat. 28. 18.

Psal. 110. 7.

Philip. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11.

Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22.

Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession, so neither when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely Oeconomical, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and determinate, when that end for which 'twas given shall be accomplished: part being either due upon the union of the humane nature with the divine, or upon covenant as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternal.

Of the first part of this Dominion did David speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he call'd his Son his Lord. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool:*

Psal. 110. 1.

Y

where

where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged untill their final and total subjection. *For he must reign, till he hath put all things under his feet.* And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdome till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. *For when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdome to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

1 Cor. 15. 25.

1 Cor. 15. 24. 28.

Psal. 110. 2.

But we must not look upon Christ onely in the nature of a General, who hath received a Commission; or of an Ambassadour, with perfect instructions: but of the onely Son of God, impowred and employed to destroy the enemies of his Fathers Kingdome: and though thus empowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the onely Son and the heir of all things in his Fathers house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings; for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcessable crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath alwayes reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings, but so that he continue still for ever High Priest, and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternal Dominion of Christ as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise, Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people. *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them, I the Lord have spoken it.* Now the promise was thus made expressly to David. *Thy house and thy kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* And although that term *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signifie oft times no more then a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable; or at the utmost, but to the end of all things, and so the Oeconomical Dominion or Kingdome of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfill that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that Oeconomy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all; and that it is so farre to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the Angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her wombe, *the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdome there shall be no end.* Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise, then in Daniel's provision of the performance; who saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven;

Ezek. 34. 23. 24.

2 Sam. 7. 16. מלך ע

Luk. 1. 32, 33.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom: that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not passe away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent Dominion, as God, the Creatour, and consequently the owner of the works of his hands, and by a derived; imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed; raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ: which authority so given and bestowed upon him, is partly Oeconomical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted, are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the humane nature, that it must be co-eval with it; that is, of eternal duration.

The third part of our Explication is the due consideration of the object of Christs Dominion, enquiring whose Lord he is, and how ours. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For he is Lord of all saith S. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implyeth not a contradiction. For he hath put all things under his feet, but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. God onely then excepted, whose original Dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be things in heaven, or things on earth. In heaven he is farre above all principalities and powers, and all the Angels of God worship him; on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all, and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this Universality of Christs Regall authority, it will be further necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly our Lord. 'Tis true, he made us, and not we our selves, we are the work of his hands, but the lowest of his Creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and cloatheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of Redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this Redemption, though a single word, we shall find a † double title to a most just Dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

Redemption, it will be necessary to take notice of the wayes, by which Humane Dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt, saith the Civilian. Inst. l. i. tit. 3. but in Theology we say more, Servi & nascuntur, & fiunt. Man is born the servant of God his maker, man is made the servant of his redeemer. Two wayes in general they observed, by which they came to serve, who were not born slaves. Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate, aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese vendundari passus est. Two wayes then also there were by which Dominion over those servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase, and both these were alwayes accounted just. Dionysius Halicarnassaw, an excellent Historian, a curious observer of the Roman customes, and an exact judge of their actions, being a Grecian, justifieth the right which the Masters in Rome claimed over

Act. 10. 36.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Heb. 1. 6.

Psal. 2. 8.

† For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word

where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged untill their final and total subjection. *For he must reign, till he hath put all things under his feet.* And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdome till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. *For when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdome to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

1 Cor. 15. 25.

1 Cor. 15. 24, 28.

Psal. 110. 2.

But we must not look upon Christ onely in the nature of a General, who hath received a Commission; or of an Ambassadour, with perfect instructions; but of the onely Son of God, impowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Fathers Kingdome: and though thus empowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the onely Son and the heir of all things in his Fathers house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings; for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcescible crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath alwayes reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings, but so that he continue still for ever High Priest, and King of kings.

Ezek. 34. 23, 24.

2 Sam. 7. 16.
עו עולם

Luk. 1. 32, 33.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

The certainty of this eternal Dominion of Christ as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise, Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people. *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them, I the Lord have spoken it.* Now the promise was thus made expressly to David. *Thy house and thy kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* And although that term *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signifie oft times no more then a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable; or at the utmost, but to the end of all things, and so the Oecononimical Dominion or Kingdome of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfill that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that Oeconomy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all; and that it is so farre to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the Angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her wombe, *the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdome there shall be no end.* Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise, then in Daniel's provision of the performance; who *saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven;*

heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom; that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not passe away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent Dominion, as God, the Creatour, and consequently the owner of the works of his hands, and by a derived; imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed; raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ: which authority so given and bestowed upon him, is partly Oeconomical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted, are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the humane nature, that it must be coeval with it; that is, of eternal duration.

The third part of our Explication is the due consideration of the object of Christs Dominion, enquiring whose Lord he is, and how ours. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For he is Lord of all saith S. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implyeth not a contradiction. For he hath put all things under his feet, but when he saith all things are put under him; it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. God onely then excepted, whose original Dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be things in heaven, or things on earth. In heaven he is farre above all principalities and powers, and all the Angels of God worship him; on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all, and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this Universality of Christs Regall authority, it will be further necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly our Lord. 'Tis true, he made us, and not we our selves, we are the work of his hands, but the lowest of his Creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and cloatheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of Redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this Redemption, though a single word, we shall find a † double title to a most just Dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

Redemption, it will be necessary to take notice of the wayes, by which Humane Dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt, saith the Civilian. Inst. l. i. tit. 3. but in Theology we say more, Servi & nascuntur, & fiunt. Man is born the servant of God his maker, man is made the servant of his redeemer. Two wayes in general they observed, by which they came to serve, who were not born slaves. Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate, aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese vœnundari passus est. Two wayes then also there were by which Dominion over those servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase, and both these were always accounted just. Dionysius Halicarnassens, an excellent Historian, a curious observer of the Roman customes, and an exact judge of their actions, being a Grecian, justifieth the right which the Masters in Rome claimed over

Act. 10. 36.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Heb. 1. 6.

Psal. 2. 8.

† For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word

their servants upon these two grounds. *Εὐγγερον δὲ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις αἱ τῆς Σεραπόσιου κλήσεις κατὰ τὰς διακρίσεις τῶν αἰώνων τρέφουσιν· ἡ γὰρ ἀνισότης παρὰ τὴν δημοσίαν τὴν ἐν δόξῃ πολλοῦ ἐν τῇ λαφύρῃ, ἢ τὴν στρατιᾷ Συγγενῶν αἰσθάνεται· ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀλλοδαπὰς ἀφαιρέσεις καὶ δουλοπλοῦς τοῖς λαβόντι ἐχεν· ἢ περιέλαβον παρ' ἑτέρον κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς τρέφουσιν κυρίως ἡγουμένων ἐν αὐτοῖς τὴν δόξαν. Hist. l. 4. Where it is also further to be observed, that the same persons were made slaves by conquest, and possessed by purchase, by conquest to the City of Rome, by purchase to the Roman Citizen. The General first took and saved them, and so made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the State from which he received his Commission, and in whose name, and for whose interest he fought: This State exposed their interest to sale, and so whatever right had been gained by the conquering sword, was devolved on the Roman Citizen for a certain summe of money paid to the State to defray the charges of that war. Thus every Lord or Master of a slave so taken, had full power over him, and possession of him, by right of purchase, unto which he was first made liable by conquest. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right is Christ become our Lord, and we his servants.*

We were first servants of the Enemy of God, for, him we obeyed, *Rom. 6. 16.* and his servants we are whom we obey; when Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, *col. 2. 15.* He spoiled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly triumphing over them. But contrary to the custome of triumphing Conquerours, he did not sell, but buy us; because while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life; upon the Crosse as his triumphant chariot he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord, by right of Redemption, both as to conquest, and to purchase.

Beside, he hath not onely bought us, but provideth for us; what e're we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is the Prince of life, and by him we live; he is the Lord of glory, and we are called by his Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord. Wherefore he hath us under his dominion, and becomes our Lord by right of Promotion.

Lastly, men were not anciently sold alwayes by others, but sometimes by themselves, and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismal vow we bind our selves unto his service, that henceforth we will not serve sin; but yield our selves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God; that as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness, and to iniquity: even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness, unto holiness. And thus the same Dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirm'd by Covenant, and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of Obligation.

The Necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the Article, appeareth first in the discovery of our condition; For by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons, nor our actions. Know ye not, saith S. Paul, that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price. And Ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the possession of their Ma-

1 cor. 6. 19, 20.

* Δεῖλον αὐτοῖς
τὴν ἐλευθερίαν· καὶ
ὡς πρὸς ὅρανον
προσέχουσιν πάντες

ὁ ὑπακούων.

Aristot. Pol. l. i. c. 4.

Τὸ, τι γὰρ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕρπον

ster,

ster, so that their persons were as properly his, as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to our selves, but to him, for in this the difference of † service and freedome doth properly consist: we cannot do our * own wills, but the will of him whose we are. Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, *a I came down from heaven, not to doe mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* First therefore we must conclude with the Apostle, reflecting upon Christ's Dominion and our Obligation; that *b none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's.*

Secondly, the same is necessary both to inforce, and invite us to obedience; to inforce us, as *the Lord*, to invite us, as *Christ the Lord*. If we acknowledge our selves to be his servants, we must *bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ*. He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such, as by their service acknowledge that Dominion which he purchased. *a He though he were a Son, yet, learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect, he is become the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.* Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of Him whom we are thus oblig'd to serve, should allure and invite us. When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. *Go thou near, said they to him, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say, and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it and do it.* If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and chearful a promise of exact obedience unto the law so given; how should we be invited to the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of man? who are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the Patriarchs did chearfully live in the land of Goshen subject to the power and command of Egypt, because that power was in the hand of Joseph their exalted brother; shall not we with all readinesse of mind, submit our selves to the divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? Shall all the Angels worship him, and all the Arch-angels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to joyn with them?

Thirdly, the Belief of Christ's Dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute Monarchs learn, the people which they rule is not their own, but the Subjects of a greater prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this S. Paul doth ground his admonition to Masters, *give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.* God gave a power to the Israelites to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves, and gives this

reason

† So Aristotle

Ethic. 4.

αὐτὸς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν

δακνόν, and in

the first of his

Rhetoricks on

the contrary,

ἐλευθερὸν τὸ μὴ

αὐτὸς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν

* τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸς ἐλευ-

θερὸν πρὸς τὴν

ἐλευθερίαν ἐπ-

ὶον, αὐτὸς μὴ δὲ

αὐτὸς ἐστὶν τὸ ζῆν

μὴ αὐτὸς ἐλευθερὸν.

Arist. Pol. 6. 2.

Quid est liber-

tas? potestas

vivendi ut ve-

lis. Cicero Pa-

rad.

a Iohn 6. 38.

b Ro. 14. 7, 8.

c 2 Cor. 10. 5.

d Heb. 5. 8, 9.

Deut. 5. 27.

Col. 4. 1.

Lev. 25. 42.

reason of the interdiction, *For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as bondmen.* What tenderness then should be used towards those, who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price? From hence those which are subject, learn to obey the powers which are of humane ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their Governours, with servants to their Masters: and S. Paul hath given them this charge, *obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ.* Neither do we learn from hence onely whom, but also how to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of Lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are alwayes ready to obey, but *in the Lord.*

Col. 3. 22, 23, 24.

Rom. 10. 12.

Lastly, this Title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds, and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for. *For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him untill all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh which war in our members, but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergoe for his sake, but if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him, and blessed be that Dominion, which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.

After this Explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and expresse himself how he would be understood, when he maketh this profession of his faith, I believe in Christ *our Lord.* For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much; I doe assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ the onely Son of God is the true *Jehovah*, who hath that being which is originally and eternally of it self, and of which all other beings doe essentially depend; that by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universal Dominion over all things, as God; that as the Son of man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly Oeconomical, for the completing our redemption, and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father, partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so eternal, as belonging to that kingdome which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation, and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service; for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and

and of purchase; and making us the sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a further right of promotion, which, considering the Covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation; and thus I believe in Christ our Lord.

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

These words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the conception of Jesus from his nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin, whereas the ancient Creeds made no such distinction, but without any particular expresse mention of the conception, had it onely in this manner, * *who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*; understanding by the word *born*, not onely the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the Article. For they which speak onely of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christs conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghost, and of the Virgin Mary.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to expresse the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so farre as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born; the second, He by whose energie or operation he was conceived; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

For the first, the Relative in the front of this, carries us clearly back unto the former Article, and tells us that he which was thus conceived and born, was Jesus Christ the onely Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated; that this onely Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it followeth that this Article at the first beginning, or by vertue of its connexion, can import no lesse then this most certain but miraculous truth, that † He which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulnesse of time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and*

* Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. *Ruffinus in Symb. S. Aug. Ench. ad Laurent. c. 34. 37. & 38. Natus de Spiritu S. & Maria Virgine, as also the Council of Francford in Sacrosyllabo. S. Aug. de Fide & Symb. Natus est per Spiritum S. ex Virgine Maria. S. Leo. Epist. 10. c. 2. Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Etherius V. xam. Author Symbol. ad Catechum. Qui natus est de Spiritu S. ex Maria Vir-*

gine. So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum. Natum de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, in Symbolo acceptum, & corde ad justitiam credit, & ore ad salutem S. Ecclesia confitetur. And Alcuinus l. 3. de Trinit. c. 1. Dicitur in Symbolo Catholice fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu S. & ex Maria Virgine sit natus. In the Ancient MSS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, & Συμβολον εν πνευματι & εξ ης Μαρίας τής παρθένου. So Paulus Samosatenus in his 5 Proposition. Ισως ο Σωμπελς εν πνευματι & εξ ης Μαρίας τής παρθένου. These omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the Council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian Heresy, as was observed by Diogenes Bishop of Cyricum in the Council of Chalcedon, Οι γαρ εχουσ πατρις οι ισαυ ταυτας, το ισχυον, & εστιν οι εχουσ Νικαια πατρις, ισαυ ταυτας ειναι, εν πνευματι & εξ ης Μαρίας τής παρθένου. In the several expositions among the Sermons de Tempore, falsely attributed to S. Aug. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu S. natus ex Virgine Maria. So Eusebius Gallicanus Homil. de Symbolo. And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary. † Huic, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc à Sp. S. templum fabricatum intra secreta uteri Viginalis intellige. *Ruff.*

born

both very ancient and farre diffus'd; making the Father to be incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was * alwayes thought to be a sufficient confutation of that fond opinion; in that the Incarnation is not subjoynd to the first, but to the second Article; we do not say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived*, but, *in his onely Son our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*.

First then we believe that He which was made flesh was the Word, that He which took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other Person but the onely begotten Son. And when we say that Person was *conceived* and *born*, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same humane nature, which is in all other men, who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the *a Mediatour between God and man, is the man Christ Jesus*. That since by *b man came death*, by *man* also should come *the resurrection of the dead*. As sure then as the first Adam, and we who are redeem'd are men, so certainly is the second Adam and our Mediatour man. He is therefore frequently called the *Son of man*, and in that nature he was alwayes promised: first *c* to Eve, as her *seed*, and consequently her son; then to Abraham, *d in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, and that *e seed is Christ*, and so is the Son of Abraham. Next to David, as his *son to sit upon his throne*, and so he is *f made of the seed of David according to the flesh*, the *son of David*, *g the son of Abraham*, and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And as he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descending from the same Father Adam; *h and therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren*. For he *laid not hold on the Angels, but on the seed of Abraham*, and so became not an Angel, but a man.

As then man consisteth of two different parts, Body and Soul, so doth Christ; He assumed *a* body at his conception, of the blessed Virgin. *i Forasmuch as the children are partakers of the flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same*. The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his *† nativity*; and the actions and passions of his life shew the nature of his flesh.

Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepulchrum secundum Scripturas, & resuscitatum à Patre, & in celos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. *And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it followeth*, Hanc Regulam ab initio Evangelii decurrit, &c. *This is yet further, evident out of Epiphanius who tells us the Eastern Doctors confuted Noetus in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed.* "Ενα θεόν δεξαμένον πατέρα, (just as Tertullian, nos unicum quidem Deum credimus) αὐτὸν αὖτε οὐρανὸν διακρίναντα δεξαμένον καὶ ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡμεῖς, καὶ ὑπὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀναστάντα, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὡς καὶ δεξιά αὐτοῦ κατέβη, ἵπτασθαι πάλιν ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ κρῖναι. And when the Argument of Tertullian against Praxeas, and the Greeks against Noetus drawn from the Creed, did not sufficiently convince the Patripassians, the Church of Aquileia to exclude them wholly, added these two words to the first Article. Invisibilem, and Impassibilem. Invisibilem, to shew he was not incarnate, Impassibilem, to shew he was not crucified. So Rufinus in the conclusion of his exposition upon these words Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, addeth, His additur invisibilem & impassibilem: and then gives the reason, Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ à nostris Patripassiana appellatur, id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, & visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur talis impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, & invisibilem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne & ex carne natum, & ex nativitate carnem Filium visibilem & passibilem factum. a 1 Tim. 2. 5. b 1 Cor. 15. 21. c Gen. 3. 15. d Gen. 22. 18. e Gal. 3. 6. f Rom. 1. 3. g Mat. 1. 1. h Heb. 2. 17. i Heb. 2. 14. † Marcion ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut ut nativitatem negaret, negavit & carnem; scilicet ne invicem sibi testimonium redderent, & responderent nativitas & caro. quia nec nativitas sine carne, nec caro sine nativitate. Tertull. de Carne Christi. c. 1.

* It appeareth plainly that Tertullian confuted Praxeas, by reducing him to these words of the Creed. For when he had first declared. Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus (which was the objection of Praxeas) sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam oikonomia dicimus, ut unici Dei sit & Filius sermo in plius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, & sine quo factum est nihil. Then he subjoyneth, Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum hominem & Deum, filium hominis, & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum

He was first born with a body which was *prepared for him*, of the same appearance with those of other infants, he grew up by degrees, and was so farre from being sustained without accustomed nutrition of our bodies, that he was observed even by his enemies to come eating and drinking, and when he did not so, he suffered hunger and thirst. Those plowers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who *plowed upon his back, and make long furrows*. The thorn's which pricked his sacred temples, the nailes which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the natural tenderness and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty dayes together, left his walking on the waters and traversing the seas, left his suddain standing in the midst of his disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh; he confirmed first his own disciples, *feel and see, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me to have*. As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confesse him to have come in the verity of our humane nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it alwayes necessary to acknowledge him: For *every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God*. This spirit appeared early in opposition to the Apostolical doctrine, and Christ who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man, as God.

Luke 24.39.

1 John 4.2,3.

† Simon Magus first made himself to be Christ, and what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto Christ. Dixerat se in monte Sina legem Mosi in Patris persona dedisse Judæis, tempore Tiberii in Filii persona putative apparuisse. S. Aug. So S. Cyril represents him, in ἐν σαρκε, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει ὡς Χριστῷ ἡμεῖν παρὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν. Catech. 6. From this distinction of his invention arose the Heresy of the Δουταί.

† Simon Magus the Arch-heretick first began, and many after followed him.

And certainly if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. For *a Jesus increased in wisdom and stature*, one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, encrease: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his years, must have a subject proper for it, which was no other then a humane soul. This was the seat of his finite understanding, and directed will, distinct from the will of his father, and consequently of his divine nature, as appeareth by that known submission, *b not my will but thine be done*. This was the subject of those affections and passions which so manifestly appeared in him; nor spake he any other then a proper language, when before his suffering he said, *c My soul is exceeding sorrowfull, even unto death*. This was it which on the crosse before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the souls of the departed are, For *d when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said thus, he gave up the ghost*. And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body, so the life of Christ as man, did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that soul with the body. So that he which was perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and humane flesh subsisting. Which is to be observed and asserted against the

For Saturninus, or Saturninus, followed him with his putative tantum hominem, as Irenæus; and in phantasmate tantum venisse, as Tertullian speaks. After him Valentinus, and his followers, Epiphanius, Isidorus, and Secundus: then the Marcosians, Heracleonites, and Ophites, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, and generally the Manichæes. These were the Δουταί or Πάταρισταί, all conspiring in this, that Christ was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to endure. *a* Luke 2.52. *b* Luke 22.42. *c* Matth. 26.38. *d* Luke 23.46.

* ancient,

* ancient Hereticks, who taught that Christ assumed humane flesh, but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

Thus the whole perfect and † complete nature of man was assumed by the Word, by him who was *conceived and born* of a woman, and so made a man. And being the Divine nature which *he had before*, could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the Divine Nature which he had, was in this Incarnation made man by that humane nature which he then assumed, and so really and truly was * both God and man. And thus this third Article from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no lesse, then the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these wayes can consist with the Person of our Saviour, or the Office of our Mediatour. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so farre from acknowledging him to be both God and Man, that thereby we should professe him to be neither God, nor Man, but a Person of a nature as different from both, as all mixt bodies are distinct from each element which concures unto their composition. Besides we know there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the Divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem of that infinite and independent being, as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in the creature.

Again, as the confusion, so the conversion of natures is impossible. For

soul and the mind, the *ψυχή* and the *νῦς*, and acknowledged that the Word assumed the body and the soul or *ψυχή* of man, but not the mind or spirit, or the *Νῦς*, but the Word itself was in the place of that. Apollinarianistas Apollinarius instituit, qui de anima Christi ab Ecclesia Catholica disenserunt, dicentes sicut *Ariani*, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In quaestione testimonium Evangelicis victis, mentem qua rationalis est anima hominis, non fuisse in anima Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in ea fuisse dixerunt. *This was then the clear difference bewixt the Arian and Apollinarian Heresy.* Apollinarianistæ quidem carnis & animæ naturam sine mente assumpsisse Deum credunt, Ariani vero carnis tantummodo. *Facundus l. 9. So that two things are to be observed in the Apollinarians, their Philosophy and their Divinity ; their Philosophy in making man consist of three distinct parts, the body, the soul, and the mind; their Divinity in making the humane nature of Christ to consist but of two, the body and the soul, and the third to be supplied by the Word. Which is excellently expressed by Nemesius, de Nat. Hom. in respect of his Philosophy. Τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ἰσὶ καὶ Πλατὼν. ἀλλὰ ὅτι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ αἴσθησιν τὴν νῦν δογματισαίους, καὶ τοιαύτῃ τὸν ἀνθρώπον συνιστάτω βέλους, οὐκ αὐτὴν καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ νῦν. Οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ Ἀπολλινάριον οὐ τοῦ Θεοῦ δίκαια φησὶν. ὁμοιωσάτω, πότεν γὰρ πηδᾶται τὸν θεμλίον τὴν σικεῖαν δέξαι, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ σαρκατικὰ δέξαι καὶ τὸ εἰσέναι δόγμα. καὶ πάλιν by Theodoret in respect of his Divinity, Σαρκατικῶς γὰρ τὸν θεὸν ἵσταν λόγον, οὐ καὶ καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνελεῖσθαι ἢ τὴν λογικὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αἰσθητὴν, ἢ φυσικὴν, ἢ ὅταν ζωτικὴν, πᾶσι ὁμοιωθῆναι. τὸν δὲ νῦν αὐτὸν πηδᾶ τὸν ψυχὴν εἰσὶν λέγειν, καὶ ἵσταν ἀνελεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀρεῖσθαι τὴν θεῖαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τὴν νῦν τὴν χρεῖαν. † Quid à Patre Christus acceptar, nisi quod & inderat? hominem sine dubio, carnis animæque texturam*
*Tertull. de Resurr. carnis. c. 34. Hoc toto credente jam mundo, puto quod & Dæmones confiteantur Filium Dei natum de Maria Virgine & carnem naturæ humanæ atque animam suscepisse. S. Hier. apol. 2. adv. Ruffinum. * Νῦν δὲ ἵστανται ἀνθρώπος αὐτοῖς; εἴτε οὐ λόγον οὐ μὲν δέξαι θεῖον καὶ νῦν ἀνθρώπον. Cl. Alex. adv. Genes. † Ablit ita credere, ut conflati quodam genere duas naturas in unam arbitremur redactas esse substantiam, hujusmodi enim commixtio partis utriusque corruptio est. Deus enim qui capax est non capabilis, penetrans non penetrabilis, implens non implebilis, qui ubique simul totus, & ubique diffusus est per insulationem potentia suæ, misericorditer naturæ mixtæ est humanæ, non humana natura naturæ est mixta divinę. Leporius Libel. Emend.*

* Of this kind
two several
sects were most
remarkable,
the Arians, &
the Apollina-
rians. Arius
taught that
Christ had no-
thing of man
but the flesh,
and with that
the Word was
joyned. Ἀρει-
ος ὁ σάρκα μόνον
ὡς ἐκ τοῦ κυρίου
τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ
ὁμοιωτος. ἀντὶ τοῦ
τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ ἐν ἡμῖν
ἐνδραυνήσας, κατὰ
τὴν φύσιν τοῦ
λόγου ἐκ τοῦ
σώματος ἵνα ἐκ-
γαγῇ. Athan.
de Adv. Christi.
Eunomius
followed him
in this parti-
cular. Ἀρει-
ος καὶ Εὐνομί-
ος ὁμοῦ ἐν τῷ
θεσφατι ἐκείνῳ
καὶ θεοτικῷ δὲ
φύσει ἐκγονή-
σαν τῷ χρεῖματι.
Theodo. l. 5.
con. Her. c. 11.
Apollinarius
distinguished
between the

* Teste Episcopo Inst. Theolog. l. 4. c. 8.

* In that proposition ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο there hath been strange force used by men of contrary judgements, and for contrary ends, as to the word ἐγένετο. The Socinians endeavouring to prove, it can have no other sense then simply suit, the Word was flesh. These Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the highest sense of factum est.

The Word was made flesh. It is confessed that the verb γινώσκειν in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient Interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriack rendred it כִּנְיָן מִן מַלְאָכָא. Et verbum caro fuit. The Ancient Latine, Et Verbum caro factum est. It cannot be denied but in the Scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old Vulgar Translation in some places renders it; as the Syriack does here. Matih. 10. 16. γινώσκειτε ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes, and 25. Ἀκούετε τὸ μυστικὸν τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ὁ δίδωσκας αὐτοῖς. Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus. From whence 'tis evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word γινώσκειν, but in the circumstance of the matter in which 'twas used. Howsoever neither of these interpretations prove either of these opinions; for if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh, and it hath been already proved, and presupposed by S. Iohn in his precedent discourse, that the Word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that He which was before the Word, & was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again, if he which was made flesh was the Word, and after he was made such was still the Word, as certainly he was, & is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh, can no way evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity. † This was the proper opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own confession in the Council of Chalcedon. Ὁμοῦς ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντων γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐκείνους, ὡς ὁ γινώσκων μίαν φύσιν ὁμοῦς. Act. 1. Two distinct natures he confessed at first, but when the union was once made, he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made he expressed not, nor could his followers agree, some attributing it to the conception, some to the resurrection, others to the Ascension. Howsoever when they were united, his opinion clearly was, that the humane nature was so absorpt into the divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there was but one, that is the divine nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by S. Leo, who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his opinion. Ser. 8. de Nativ. Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus assertor, unionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum, ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus ulterius existente substantia. And the Eranistes in the Dialogue of Theodoret arguing for that opinion, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining the other did not so; answered plainly, Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ μαρμαρίνῃ καὶ ἀποθνήσκῃ ὃ καὶ τῆς τῆς ἀνθρώπου φύσεως.

body

body and blood of Christ, and thereby shewed, that the humane nature of Christ is no more really converted into the divinity, and so ceaseth to be the humane nature; then the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby cease to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those dayes understood no such doctrine as that of * Transubstantiation.

Being then He which is conceived was the *only Son of God*, and that *only Son* begotten of the substance of the Father, and so always subsisted in the divine nature; being by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assum'd an humane nature, being these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that *only Son* was he which is conceived and born; it followeth, that the Union which was not made in the nature, was made in the person of the Word: that is, it was not so made, that out of both natures one *only* should

* There can be no time in which we may observe the Doctrine of the Ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an Heresy evidently known, and make use generally of the same Arguments against it.

Now what the Heresy of Eutyches was, is certainly known, and the nature of the Sacrament was generally made use of as an Argument to confute it. Gelasius Bishop of Rome hath written an excellent book against Eutyches De duabus naturis in Christo. In which he propoundeth their opinion thus, Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, divinam. *And sola existente Deitate, humanitas illic esse jam destitit. That then which he disputes against, is the Transubstantiation of the humane nature into the divine. The Argument which he makes use of against it, is drawn from the Eucharist. Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficiuntur consortes naturæ: & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, & sumus, ut Sicut in hanc, scilicet, in divinam transeant; S. Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanentes tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ, sicut illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant, ex quibus constat propriè permanentibus, unum Christum quia integrum verumque permanere demonstrant. In which words 'tis plain he affirms the union of the Humane nature of Christ to be the principal mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; he concludes from thence, that as in the representation, the substance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the humane nature of Christ in the greater mystery doth still remain. In the margin of this place in the Bibliotheca Patrum there is printed Caute, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the Fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerately. In the same manner we find a Disputation between an Heretick and a Catholick in the second Dialogue of Theodoret, where Eranistes, as an Heretick, asks Orthodoxus, by what names he calls the bread and wine after consecration, who answers, the Body and Blood of Christ; From whence Eranistes argues, ὡς περ τοῦτον τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὕτως καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον μεταβάλλει καὶ ἵπταται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὴν Θεοῦ μεταβάλλει τὴν φύσιν. As the Symbols of the body and blood of Christ are one thing before consecration, and after that change their name and become another, so the body of Christ after his ascension is changed into the divine substance. To this Orthodoxus answers, Ἐάν τις αὐτὸς ἀποκρίσῃ. You are taken in your own nets. Οὐδὲ γάρ ποτε τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ Θεοῦ οὕτως ἐξέειπεν, ὡς τὸν Θεοῦ, ὡς τὸν Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ γὰρ ποτε τὸν Θεοῦ οὕτως ἐξέειπεν, ὡς τὸν ἄνθρωπον. The bread and wine even after consecration leave not their own nature, but remain in their former substance, shape, and form. In the same manner, καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὴ ἀποκρίσῃ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὴν Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὴν Θεοῦ. The body of Christ hath the same form, figure and shape, and indeed the same bodily substance. And when Eranistes still objects, that the bread is called the body and not bread, Orthodoxus answers that he is mistaken. Οὐ γὰρ σῶμα μόνον ἀπαρτίζεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζῶντι ὀνομαζέται, ὡς αὐτοὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀποκαλύπτει, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα Θεογονουμένου καὶ Θεοῦ. For it is not *only* called the body, but also bread of life, and the body it self we call the divine body. Who sees not then that Theodoret believed no more that the bread is converted into the body, than that the body is converted into the divinity of Christ? Who perceives not that he thought the bread to be as substantially and really bread after the consecration, as the body of Christ is really a body after his ascension? The same Argument is used by S. Chrysostome upon the same occasion against the Apollinarians in his Epistle ad Cesarium, not yet published in Greek, and by Ephraimus in Thotii Bibliotheca against the Eutychians. As therefore all the *misasphesias* of the Sacramental elements maketh them not cease to be of the same nature which before they were, so the humane nature of Christ joyned to the divine, loseth not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a substance in it self distinct, and so Christ doth subsist not *only* ex but in duabus naturis, as the Council of Chalcedon determined against Eutyches.*

result;

result; but only so, that to one Person no other should be added.

Nor is this Union only a scholastick speculation, but a certain and necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediatour, but two Mediatours; without which we cannot joyn the second Article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred Scriptures, or understand the History of our Saviour. For certainly He which was before Abraham, was in the dayes of Herod born of a woman; He which preached in the dayes of Noah, began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being at that time about thirty years of age; He was demonstrated the Son of God with power, who was the seed of David according to the flesh; He who died on the Crosse, raised him from the dead who died so, being *put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit*; He was of the fathers according to the flesh, who was *God over all blessed for ever*. Being these and the like actions and affe-

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Rom. 9.5.

† This Heresy
doth most for-
mally contra-
dict these

words of the Creed, because it immediately denies this truth, that the eternal Son of God was conceived and born. And in vain did Nestorius seek not only to avoid it in the Nicene Creed, but to make use of the words of the Creed even against the Unity of the Person of Christ. S. Cyril had well objected the series, order and consequence of that Confession. "Εὐν ἡ ἀγία καὶ μαρὰ Σουδοῦς αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν, μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ ἀληθινόν, τὸν φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτός, τὸν δι τὸ πᾶσι πιστῶσαι ὁ Πατήρ, κατέβησεν, σπερματικῶς καὶ ἐκ ἀνδρῶντος, παθεῖν, ἀναστῆναι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀναλθεῖν εἰς ἐξουσίαν. The strength of this objection lies in this, that Christ the only-begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds, was incarnate. The answer of Nestorius was in this manner. Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰωάννῃ Χριστῷ, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ μονογενῆ σκότιστος ὅπως Ἰωσὴφ, Χριστῷ, καὶ μονογενῆ, καὶ υἱὸς ὁμογενῆ υἱοῦ. τὰ κοινὰ τῆς δόξης καὶ ἀδελφότητος, αἱ ἐκ θυμαλίας, ὁμομας, τὸν τὸν τῆς ἀνδρῶντος, καὶ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τῆς ἀνατομῆς ἰσχυροδύμει πνεύματι. And the strength, or rather the weakness thereof is this: that first the Council placed the name of Iesus, Christ, and the only-begotten Son, names common to the divinity and humanity of Christ, and then upon them built the doctrine of his Incarnation. Whereas it is evident that, supposing the Only-begotten a term common to the humanity and divinity, yet the Council clearly expounds it of the eternal generation, adding immediately, begotten of his Father before all worlds; neither is there any word between that exposition and the Incarnation, but such as speak wholly of Christ as God. Therefore that only-begotten Son, who was begotten of his Father before all worlds, descended from heaven and was incarnate. Thus S. Cyril in his second Epistle to Nestorius, and Nestorius in his second to him. Which mistake of his seems yet more strange to me, when I consider in the same Epistle of Nestorius that fundamental truth asserted, which of it self sufficiently, nay fully, confutes his Heresy. For he acknowledges the name of Christ so be ἀπαθὲς καὶ παθὴρ τὸν εἶνα καὶ μοναδικὸν ἀσώπτον ἀσπερσῆς σωματικῶς, and consequently Christ himself to be a single Person in a double nature, passible and impassible: which once is granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time, for by those several natures, he had those several natures; that he which was passible as God, might and did suffer as man, because the same Person was as of an impassible and a passible nature, impassible, as God, passible, as man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, was incarnate, and made man; and as evident out of the Apostles Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same only-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

BY THE HOLY GHOST.

HAVING thus dispatch'd the consideration of the first Person concern'd in this Article, and the Actions contained in it so farre as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same, and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration; first, of the conception, secondly, of the person, thirdly, of the operation. But for the person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here onely mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article where it is propounded directly. And for the Conception it self, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the Act cannot be predicated. For though Christ *was conceived by the Holy Ghost*, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, *thou shalt conceive*. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to this second part, but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be *conceived by him*.

Luke 1.31.

Now when we say the Conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the Angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a son, she said *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* by which words she excludeth first all men, and then her self; all men by that assertion, *I know not a man*, her self by the question, *how shall this be, seeing it so?* First, our Melchizedeck had no father on earth, in general, not any man, in particular, not Joseph. 'Tis true *his mother Mary was espous'd to Joseph*, but 'tis as true, *before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*. We read in S. Luke that *the parents brought up the Child Jesus into the Temple*, but these Parents were not the Father and the Mother, but as it followeth, *Joseph and his Mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him*. 'Tis true Philip calleth him *Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph*, and which is more, his Mother said unto him, *Behold, thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing*. But this must be onely the reputed father of Christ, he being onely, *as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Eli*. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse, who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the Genealogy belongs to him, whereas in that very place where the Genealogy begins, Joseph is called the supposed Father. How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when in the same place where it is prov'd that Joseph came from David, it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not onely in S. Luke where Joseph begins, but also in S. Matthew where he ends the Genealogy. *a Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ*. Howsoever then the Genealogies are describ'd, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not onely that Christ descended lineally from David according

Luke 1.34.

Matth. 1.18.

Luke 2.27.

Luke 2.33.

John 1.45.

Luke 2.48.

Luke 3.23.

a Matth. 1.16.
Indeed in our translation whom may relate to both as well as one, and so Joseph as well as Mary, but in the Original it evidently belongs to Mary.
τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Μαριαμ
ἡ ἣ ἐστὶν ἡ Μαριαμ
ἡ μήτηρ.

ing

ing to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

Gen. 1. 28.

Secondly, as the Blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion, so did she exclude her self by the manner of the question, shewing that of her self she could not cause any such conception. Although she may be thought the root of Jesse, yet could she not germinate of her self; Though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the divine benediction which was given to both together: For God blessed them and said unto them, *Be fruitfull and multiply, and replenish the earth.* Though Christ was promised as the seed of the woman, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive, because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible, and the Angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, *For with God nothing shall be impossible.* God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation.

Luke 1. 37.

Luke 1. 35.

But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scriptures are very general: first, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to Mary, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;* secondly, as they suppose the conception already past, *when his Mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost;* and give satisfaction unto Joseph, *Fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost.* Now being the expressions in the Scriptures are so general, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin, much lesse shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction made in this Article, *conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin,* because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him according to the prophecy, *thou shalt conceive and bear a son;* and therefore notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of * Prepositions be sufficient rightly to distinguish these opera-

* *As conceptus de Spiritu S. natus ex Maria Vir-*

gine. S. Aug. indeed hath delivered a distinction between De and Ex, after this manner, speaking to those words of the Apostle, Quoniam ex ipso, & per ipsum, & in ipso sunt omnia. Ex ipso non hoc significat quod de ipso. Quod enim de ipso est, potest dici ex ipso, non autem omne quod ex ipso est, recte dicitur de ipso. Ex ipso enim coelum & terra, quia ipse fecit eas; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantia sua. Sicut aliquis homo si gignat filium, & faciat domum; ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus; sed filius de ipso, sicut domus de terra & ligno. De Nat. Boni. adv. Manich. c. 27. This distinction having no foundation in the Latine tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of Prepositions; for as we read of Mary $\eta \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \chi \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$, so also of the Holy Ghost, $\kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$, and $\tau \eta \nu \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \chi \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$. It is therefore said as well $\kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$ as $\epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$. Again, the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one de qua natus est Jesus, and for the other in utero habens de Spiritu S. correspondently in the Greek Creeds $\kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$ in Marias, or as in the Nicene, $\epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$ $\kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu$. And the Latine not onely de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, but sometimes de Sp. S. & Maria Virgine, and de Maria Virgine. Chrysol. and S. Aug. often de Trinitate. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of S. Augustines distinction, and then applied it to Christs conception; first taking the preposition de to signifie no lesse then a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost; because the eternal Son who was so begotten, was of the same substance.

stance with the Holy Ghost. Thus Thomas Aquinas has delivered the subtilty. Sum. p. 3. q. 32. a. 2. In Spiritu S. duplex habitudo consideratur respectu Christi. Nam ad ipsum Filium Dei qui dicitur esse conceptus, habet habitudinem consubstantialitatis; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem causæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpositio De utramque habitudinem designat, sicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem esse de suo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere possumus Christum esse conceptum de Sp. S. hoc modo quod efficientia Sp. S. referatur ad corpus assumptum, consubstantialis vero ad personam assumptam. But this distinction of consubstantiality and effective causality can make nothing for the propriety of the Phrase; for the Preposition De signifieth the material cause as well as the efficient, it must do so in respect of that which is the effect; if it require that the thing which is made, be made of the substance of that de quo est, then must Christ according unto that which is made, be made of the substance of the Holy Ghost; or to speak in the words of the Scripture, Quod in ea natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est. Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin must be acknowledged of the substance of the Holy Ghost, or else the Preposition De must not be taken in S. Augustine's sense. Howsoever being there is but one preposition in common to both in the Original Greek; being the Vulgar Translation useth De indifferently for either; being where they have distinguished De and Ex, they have attributed Ex which doth not signify consubstantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confesse he did assume the substance of his body; and De, which signifieth, (as they say consubstantiality) to the Holy Ghost, of whose substance he received nothing: it followeth, that the difference in the Prepositions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Christ's conception.

tions. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the Action of the Holy Ghost, but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly the Mother of Christ, (as certainly she was, and we shall hereafter prove) then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him, whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb; and consequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, then what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a Mother. When the Scripture speaketh of Regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing the sons of God as begotten not of blouds, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: And in the incarnation of our Saviour, we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring, but as the blouds in the language of the Hebrews did signifie that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ, that he was made of the substance of his Mother.

But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the Father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said, Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, if the Ancients speak as if he † generated the Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of paternity.

Again, as the Holy Ghost did not frame the humane nature of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he formed any part of his flesh of any other substance then of the Virgin. For certainly he was of the Fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the son of David and of Abraham. The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way before Christ's conception by which he could be the Only-begotten Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ: one part received from the Virgin, and so consequently from David, and from Abraham, from whom that Virgin did descend; another

† As Chrysostomus Serm. 57
Ubi Spiritus generat, Virgo parturit, totum divinum geritur, nihil humanum
Et Serm. 62.
Stupenti mundo solus aperi quid est, quod Spiritus generat, Virgo concipit, Virgo parit.

† Deus ipsemet ad sanguinem Mariæ addidit a-liam materi-am, ex quibus deinde Christus conceptus & natus est. *Smalcinus De vero & Naturali Dei Filio*, c. 2. Verum manet generationem & hanc dici posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest, si ad sanguinem Mariæ addita sit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Mariæ juncta natus sit Christus.

Ib. c. 3. What this was thus added to the substance of the Virgin, he elsewhere explains: Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam substantiam cre-

aram vel immisisse aut ibi creasse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, verus homo generatus fuit. This he doth not onely, without any authority, affirm, but ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For so it follows, Alias enim homo ille Dei Filius à conceptione & nativitate proprie non fuisset. And again, Necessitas magna fuit ut Christus ab initio vitæ suæ esset Deo Filius, qualis futurus non fuisset, nisi Dei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset, quod ad constituendum Christi corpus una cum Mariæ sanguine concurrir. Thus while they deny the eternal generation of the Son, they establish a temporal in such manner as is not consonant with that Word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Christ partly descending from the Fathers, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, sin onely excepted, they have invented a body partly like ours, partly not, and so in no part totally like. Indeed some of the Ancients did speak so as to make the Holy Ghost the semen Dei: as Tertullian; Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei semine, i. e. Spiritu, ut esset hominis filius, caro ei sola erat ex hominis carne sumenda sine viri semine. Vacabat enim viri semen apud habentem Dei semen. De carne Christi c. 18. And S. Hilary calls it Sementivam incuntes Spiritus efficaciam, l. 2. de Trin. But in this they onely understood the Operation of the Spirit, loco feminis. And whosoever spake of any proper semen, they abhorred; as appears by the 191 Sermon de Tempore. Nec, ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur, Spiritum S. dicimus pro semine fuisse, sed potentia & virtute Creatoris operatum. I know not whether be the greatest folly, to make the Holy Ghost the Father, as these men have done, by creating part of his body by way of seminal conjunction; or to make the same Spirit Mother of Christ, as the Nazareans did. In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lectitant Nazaræi, Salvator inducitur loquens, Modo me arripuit Mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus. There is onely this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the H. Ghost a partial, the other total mother. † Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco & habitu tantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter totum genus humanum damnaretur, non solvitur ac diluitur, nisi per unum Mediatorem Dei & hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei opus non esset renasci. S. Aug. Ench. c. 48. a Rom. 8. 3. b 2 Cor. 5. 21. c 1 Pet. 2. 22. d 1 Pet. 1. 19. e Heb. 7. 26. f Jo. 3. 5.

† framed by the Spirit, and conjoynd with it: by the one part of which humanity he was the son of man, as by the other part he was the son of God.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone God hath declared himself to be well-pleased. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?* saith Job; a clean and undefil'd Redeemer, out of an unclean and undefiled nature? He whose name is holiness, whose operation is to sanctifie, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things, as born of a woman; sin onely excepted, as *conceived by the Holy Ghost*. This original and total sanctification of the humane nature was first necessary to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who out of the infinite love humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind: that as the † first Adam was the fountain of our impurity, so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. *a God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh;* which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinful flesh. *b The Father made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made righteousness of God in him;* which we could not have been made in him, but that he *c did no sin, and knew no sin.* For whosoever is sinful wanteth a Redeemer, and he could have redeemed none, who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed *a with the precious blood of Christ:* therefore precious, because of *a Lamb without blemish, and without spot.* Our atonement can be made by no other high Priest, then by him who is *c holy, harmlesse, undefiled, and separate from sinners.* We cannot *know that he was manifested to take away our sins,* except we also know,

that

that in him is no sin. Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our humane nature in the Person of our Saviour, it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost. Again; it hath been * observed, that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the Grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God; so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the humane nature in its first originall, † without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word: so that the grace was coexistent, and in a manner connatural with it. The Mystery of the Incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodness of God. * *Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from on high hath visited us.* In this ^b the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appear'd. And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love of God and mercy to man alone, offer'd unto him in the Incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men onely; yet because they speak so generally with reference to Gods mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all universally. Especially considering the impossibility of * merit in Christ's humanity, in respect of his conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived; nor can that merit which is not:

1 Iohn 3. 5. In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret.
S. Aug. By S. Augustine. Ex hoc, quod de Sp. S. est secundum hominem naturam Christi, quid aliud, quam ipsa gratia, demonstratur?
Ench. c. 37. † Modus iste quo natus est Christus de Sp. S. non sicut filius, & de Maria virgine sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, quam homo nullis precedentibus meritis, in ipso exordio naturæ suæ quo esse cepit, verbo Dei copulatur in tantam Personæ unitatem, ut idem ipse esset filius Dei qui filius hominis, & filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac sic in humana naturæ assumptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per Sp. S. fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut etiam dicatur Dei Donum. Id. c. 40.
*a Luke 1. 78. b Tit. 3. 4. * Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat natura humana, ad personam tamen unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; & tantam gratiam, ut nulla sit maior, nulla prorsus æqualis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis ulla merita præcesserunt, sed ab illa susceptione merita ejus cuncta cæperunt. S. Aug. Tract. 82. in Iohan. c. Iohn 1. 13. † Eâ gratiâ sit ab initio fidei suæ homo quicumque Christianus, quâ gratiâ homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipso Spiritu & hic renatus, de quo est ille natus. Eodem Spiritu sit in nobis remissio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum est ut nullum haberet ille peccatum. S. Aug. de Prædest. Sanct. c. 15. * Nolite desperare, quod semel natus est ex Maria, quotidie & in nobis nascitur. Hiero. comm. in Psal. 84. 17.*

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy: by this we learn from what foundation this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the wombe: but as he was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are ^c *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* The same overshadowing power which formed his humane nature, reformeth ours; and the † same Spirit assureth us a remission of our sins; which caus'd in him an exemption from all sin. He which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born I within us upon our regeneration. All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the Article, whereby every person may understand what he is to professe, and expresse what is the Object of his Faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.* For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the onely-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man; taking to himself the humane nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoyning it

with the divine in the unity of his person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnal copulation, not by the common way of humane propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.*

BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

THe third Person considerable in this third Article is represented under a threefold description, of her Name, Condition, and Action. The first telleth us who it was, it was *Mary*; the second informeth us what she was, a *Virgin*; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God: *which was born of the Virgin Mary.*

Luke 1. 27.

† For some have thought the dignity of the Virgin to

be denoted in her name. As Greg. Nyss. (or rather his Interpolator) Hom. in Natal. Christi: Ἐκείνην ἵνα ἴδωμεν τὸ πᾶν, ἀνέμασεν ἑαυτὴν Μαρίαν οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου. Mistaking, as I conceive, the origination of Mary for that of Anna, her mother, ἡν. Thus he thought Grace, others Dominion, to be contained in her name. Ἡ Μαρία ἱμῶντος ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος. Κόμος γὰρ ἵμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος. Author Hom. de Laud. B. Mariae, sub nomine Epiphani. Τὴν κοίτην ἡν ἱμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος ἡν ἱμῶντος. Damasce, Orithod. Fid. l. 4. c. 15. S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebraicis. Sciendum quod Maria sermone Syro Domina nuncupatur. So Chrysologus, Dignitas Virginis annunciat ex nomine. Nam Maria Hebræo Sermone, Latine Domina nuncupatur. Vocat ergo Angelus Dominam, ut dominatoris genitricem trepidatio deserat servitutis, quam nasci & vocari Dominam ipsa sui germinis fecit & impetravit autoritas. Serm. 142. Sermone Syro Maria Domina nuncupatur, & pulchre, quia Dominum genuit. Isidor. Hispal. Orig. l. 7. c. 10. The same Isidore with others gives another Etymology. Maria illuminatrix, sive stella maris, genuit enim lumen mundi. And Bernard. Homil. 2. super Misus est, Loquimur pauca & super hoc nomine, quod interpretatum maris stella dicitur, & matri Virgini valde convenienter aptatur. Ipsa namque aptissime syderi comparatur: quia sicut sine sui corruptione sydus suum emittit radium, sic absque sui lésione Virgo parturit filium. So far not amiss. But when from a bad Etymology he makes worse Divinity, calling her the Star of Jacob, and attributing unto her the light of our minds, the life of our graces, and extirpation of our vices, (the work of the Spirit of Christ) when in the midst of all our temptations, horrors of conscience, and depths of despair, he adviseth us immediately to a Respite Stellam, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca; his interpretation can warrant no such devotion. This etymology also descendeth from S. Hierome, who in his Interpretation of the names in Exodus, as from Philo, Maria illuminatrix mea, vel illuminans eos, aut smyrna maris, vel stella maris. And again on the names in S. Matthew, Mariam plerique existimant interpretari, illuminant me isti, vel illuminatrix, vel smyrna maris; sed mihi nequaquam videtur. Melius autem est ut dicamus sonare eam stellam maris, sive amarum mare. Epiphani. Ἡ Μαρία ἱμῶντος. Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariae. Dictæ sunt & ante Mariæ multæ: nam & Maria soror Aaron dicta fuit, sed illa Maria amaritudo maris vocabatur. S. Ambros. Instit. Virg. c. 5. Indeed that ab amaritudine, without the adjection of mare, is the Etymology observed by the Jews, as appears by the Author of the Life of Moses, who relating how Amrā took Jochebed to wife, & of her begat a daughter, addeth חַמֻּלָה מִרְיָם she was called Miriam, because at that time the Egyptians, who were the off-spring of Cham, made the lives of the Sons of Israel bitter. And in the like manner Seder Olam, מִרְיָם מִי עַל שֶׁם מִרְיָם, מִרְיָם מִי עַל שֶׁם מִרְיָם.

miring

miring countrymen, *Is not this the Carpenters Son? Is not his Mother called Mary?* Otherwise the name was common even at that time to many; to the sister of Lazarus, to the mother of James and Joses, to the wife of Cleophas, to the mother of John whose surname was Mark, to her which was of Magdal in Galilee, to her who bestowed much labour on S. Paul. Nor is there any original distinction between the name of these and of the Mother of our Lord. For as the name of Jesus was the same with Josuah, so this of Mary was the same with Miriam. The first of which name recorded was the daughter of Amram, the sister of Moses and Aaron, a Prophetesse; to whom the bringing of Israel out of Egypt is attributed, as well as to her brethren. *For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, saith the Lord, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants, and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.* As she was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage; so was this Mary exalted to become the Mother of that Saviour, who through the red Sea of his blood hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type: and even with the confession of the lowliness of an handmaid she seems to bear that exaltation in her name.

Matth. 13, 55

Iohn 11, 1.

Matth. 27, 56.

Iohn 19, 25.

Acts 12, 12.

Luke 8, 2.

Rom. 16, 6.

* This is to be observed, by reason of some learned men, who make the name of the Virgin different from that of others called Mary in the Gospel, upon two grounds in respect of the accent, and the termina-

tion; the one being Μαριάμ, the other Μαρία; the first with an Hebrew termination, indeclinable, and the Accent in ultima, the latter with a Greek termination, declinable, and the Accent in penultima. As Μαριάμ the Μαρία Μαριάμ, Luke 15, 27. in the Nominative; Μαρία Μαριάμ, Luke 2, 5. in the Dative; Μαρία Μαριάμ, Matth. 1, 20. in the Accusative; Μαρία Μαριάμ, Luke 1, 30. in the Vocative case. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never named Μαρία: as none of the rest by any of the Evangelists is ever called Μαριάμ. But notwithstanding this observation, we find the same Virgin's name declined: as Μαρία Μαριάμ, Matth. 1, 16. and Μαρία Μαριάμ, Rom. 16, 6. both which must come from the Greek termination Μαρία in recto. And on the contrary, that Mary which S. Paul mentioneth hath the same Hebrew termination with the Virgin, Μαριάμ Μαριάμ, Rom. 16, 6. Beside, the Syriac Translation makes no difference between the name of these and of the Virgin; as Μαρία Μαριάμ, Mark 15, 20. So again Μαρία Μαριάμ, Mat. 28, 1. And therefore there can be no sufficient foundation for any such distinction. For where as we first read Exod. 15, 20. the LXX. translate it, Μαρία Μαριάμ, and the Vulgar Lat. Maria prophetissa. The Hebrew first was מרים Mirjam; the Syriac altering the pronunciation, not the letters, Μαρία Marjam, as for מרים מרים. And because the Greek language admitteth no Iod Consonant, they pronounced it Μαρία. Though sometimes indeed even the Greeks did use the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as Lucian with the Latines makes Ἰουδαί of three syllables.

Ἰουδαίον Ἰουδαίον Ἰουδαίον.

Again, because no Greek word endeth in μ, to make it current in that language, it was necessary to alter the termination, according to their customs; as for Annibal Ἀννίβα, Asdrubal Ἀσδρὺβαλ, Amilcar Ἀμιλκαρ, and Kair, Κάιρ. This was to be done sometimes by addition, as Νάχ Νάχ, Ἀλφά Ἀλφά, Δαμῖν Δαμῖν, Ἰαπὶδ Ἰαπὶδ, Ἐννέ Ἐννέ, Σιδ Σιδ, Ἀδμῖν Ἀδμῖν, Ἀλφάμ Ἀλφάμ, & Ἀλφάμ. And so for Μαρίαμ, Μαρίαμ, or Μαριάμ. Josephus, Μαρίαμ ἡ ἀδελφή Μωϋσέως, of Miriam the Sister of Moses; whom in another place he calls Μαρίαμ ἡ ἀδελφή Μωϋσέως. Therefore he thought the name of Mariamne to be the same with Miriam. And as the Greeks were wont to add their own terminations to exotick words; so did they at other times leave out the exotick terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for Ἀβρα & ἡ, Ἀλφά & ἡ, for Ἀβρα & ἡ, Ἀλφά & ἡ, & Ζαβ, for Ζαβ & ἡ, for Μαρίαμ Μαρία. Wherefore from the Hebrew Miriam, came by variety of pronunciation at first the Syriac Marjam; and from the Syriac Marjam, at first, only by variation of pronunciation, Μαρίαμ, then, for the propriety of termination, Μαρία. a Mic. 6, 4. For though that Interpretation Domina may seem to come conveniently enough from Μαρία, yet that being rather from the Chaldees, cannot so well agree with Miriam; nor is the μ so properly added at the end, as to the beginning of an Hebrew word, where it is usually in words of simple signification Heemantick. Again, though Μαρία may signify Smyrna maris, or Illuminatrix, which S. Hierome rejected, and Stella (or rather stilla, which is properly μ) maris, or amatum mare, which he rather embraced; yet these compositions are not so proper, or probable at all, especially in a name dissyllable. Though the Jews themselves deduce it from מרים, to signify the bitterness of the Egyptian bondage, as we read in Midrash Rabbah beside the two Authors before quoted, yet still the addition of the final Mem is not proper, or if that should stand for מרים, there were no good Account to be given of the Iod. Whereas if we deduce it from the Radix מרים, with the addition of the Heemantick Mem, the notation is evident, and the signification clear, as of one exalted above others.

Beside

Sion of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* That new creation of a man is therefore new, and therefore a creation, because wrought in a woman onely, without a man, compassing a man. Which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, † literal and clear, and whatsoever the Jewes have invented to elude, it is frivolous and forc'd. For while they force the phrase of *compassing a man* in the latter part of the prediction to any thing else then a conception, they do not onely wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easie to perform.

But if this Prophecie of Jeremy seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of Isaiah, *a Behold, a Virgin shall conceive & bear a Son, & shall call his name Emmanuel.* The ancient Jewes, immediately upon the promulgation of the Gospel, understanding well how near this place did presse them, gave three several answers to this Text: first denying that it spake of a † Virgin at all; secondly asserting that it could not belong to * Jesus; thirdly affirming that it was fully compleated in the person of † Ezechias. Whereas the Original word was translated a *Virgin*, by such * Interpreters as were Jewes themselves, some hundred yeares before our Saviours birth. And did not the notation of the word, and frequent use thereof in the Scriptures per-

Jerem. 31.22.

† For it is not to be denied that the proper signification of כָּכָב is circundare, or cingere. R. Iudah has observed but one interpretation of this Verb כָּכָב: עָוֵן אָחֵר: and Kimchi testifieth, that all words which come from the root כָּכָב signify incompassing or circulation. Therefore those words נָקְבָה חֲסוֹבָה נָכַר

must literally import no less than that a woman shall encompass or enclose a man, which with the addition of a new creation, may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messias: as appeareth in Berehith Rabba Parash. 89. where shewing that God doth heal with that with which he woundeth, he saith, as he punished Israel in a virgin, so would he also heal them with a Virgin, according to the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, and R. Iosuah the son of Levi, יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ הַמַּשִּׁיחַ שֶׁן הָיִים יִלְדֵתוֹ. This is Messias the King, of whom it is written (Psal. 2.7.) This day have I begotten thee. And again in Midrash Tullim upon the 2. Pf. R. Huna in the name of R. Idi speaking of the sufferings of the Messias, saith that when his hour is come, God shall say, קִלְכָּרְאוֹתֵי בְרִית הוֹשִׁיעַ הֵם וְרוּחֵךְ. I must create him with a new creation. And so (by virtue of that new creation) he saith, this day have I begotten thee. From whence it appeareth that this sense is of it self literally clear, and that the ancient Rabbins did understand it of the Messias; whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we profess, that Jesus was born of a Virgin, and therefore is the Christ. a Isa. 7.14. † How soon these Objections were made use of by the Jews will appear by Iustine Martyr, the first Writer which made any considerable explication and defence of the Christian religion; who in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, shews us what were the Objections of the Rabbins: Ἐπει δὲ οὐ μὲν ἐστὶν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ὑμῶν πολλοὶ τὸ λῆγεν, μὴδὲ εἰρημάζει τῇ θεωρητικῇ ἡσυχίᾳ, ἰδὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐκ γαστρὸς ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἰδὲ ἡ παρὲν ἐκ γαστρὸς λαλεῖ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν υἱόν. And Tertullian, whose works are full of the Divinity of Iustine, Si quando ad deiciendos aliquos ab hac divina prædicatione, vel convertere singulos simplices quosque gestitis, mentiri audetis, quasi non virginem, sed juvenculam concepturam Scriptura contineat. Advers. Iudæos c.9. & advers. Marcionem, lib. 3. cap. 13. † And as they soon began, so did they go on with his Objection, Hodie, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Iudæi, Eisaia docente de Maria & virginitate ejus, Ecce virgo in utero concipiet, & pariet filium, in Hebræo juvenculam scriptum esse, non virginem, id est, halma, non bethula. * Dicunt Iudæi, provocemus istam prædicationem Eisaie, & faciamus comparisonem, an Christo qui jam venit competat illi primo nomen quod Eisaia prædicavit, & insignia ejus quæ de eo nunciavit. Equidem Eisaia prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, dehinc virtutem sumpturum Damasci & spolia Samariæ adverterus regem Assyriorum Porto, inquit, iste qui venit, neque sub ejusmodi nomine est dictus, neque re bellica functus. Tertul. adv. Iudæos. n So Iustine testifieth of the Jews, speaking to Trypho, and in him to them: Ἐπει δὲ οὐ μὲν ἐστὶν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ὑμῶν πολλοὶ τὸ λῆγεν, μὴδὲ εἰρημάζει τῇ θεωρητικῇ ἡσυχίᾳ. And Trypho replies again to Iustine. Ἰδὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐκ γαστρὸς ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἰδὲ ἡ παρὲν ἐκ γαστρὸς λαλεῖ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν υἱόν. * The LXX. Ἰδὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐκ γαστρὸς λαλεῖ. 'Tis true, the rest of the Interpreters, concurring with the Objection of the Jews, translated it, ἰδὲ ἡ παρὲν, i. e. adolescentula or juvenula. But as their antiquity, so their authority is far short of the LXX. especially in this case. I shall not need to shew how the Origination of פָּרָה from פָּרָה proves no less. We know the affinity of the Pubick tongue with the Hebrew, and by the testimony of S. Hierome, Lingua Punica, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, proprie virgo alina appellatur.

swade

Thirdly, we believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not onely before and after his Nativity, but also for ever the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient † as to the mystery of the Incarnation, that when our Saviour was conceived and born, his Mother was a Virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first fruit of her wombe; though there be no further mention in the Creed then that he was *born of the Virgin Mary*: yet the peculiar eminency and unparell'd privilege of that Mother, the special honour and reference due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have perswaded the Church of God in all ages to believe, that she still continued in the same Virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the * *Ever-Virgin Mary*. As if the Gate of the Sanctuary in the Prophet Ezechiel were to be understood of her, * *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be open'd, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.*

† Many indeed have taken the boldness to deny this truth, because not recorded in the sacred writ; and not onely so, but to assert the contrary as deliver'd in the Scriptures, but with no success. For though, as they object, S. Matthew testifieth that *Joseph knew not Mary, untill she had brought forth her first-born Son*; from whence they would infer, that afterwards he knew her: yet the manner

quis prorupit iustitiam, ut assereret negatam fuisse Mariam à Salvatore, eo quod post natiuitatem illius iuncta fuerit Joseph. *Homil. 7. in Lucam.* Tertullian himself was produced as an assertor of the same opinion; nor does S. Hierome deny it, though I think he might have done it. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, delivered the same, says Epiphanius; and Eunomius with his, τὸν Ἰωάννην μὲν τὸν ἀφ' ἑσέως γεννηθέντα. Photius out of Philostorgius. Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philostorgius, for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never expresse their opinions with an ἑσέως. And as he always commended Eunomius, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is a man of his own sect. At that Epigramme,

Εὐνομίαν.

Ἰσοπλὴν ἱεροῦσα Θεῷ χαρίτων Κορρῆ.

which I therefore mention, because Gosfred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the Verse, ἱεροῦσα ἀδύ, and a worse interpretation in the Inscription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholick, and the name of the sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake saying Eunomianus was the name of a man, twice spoken of in Suidas, once in, Εὐνομίαν, and again in Εὐνοίαν. 'Tis true indeed Suidas says expressly, Εὐνομίαν, ὄνομα ἁγίου: and immediately adds these words, τὸν δ' Εὐνομίαν ἱεροῦσα Βασιλέως. τὸ δ' εἶναι λατρεῖν, as if Elisharius had baptized one whose name was Eunomianus. But the words are taken out of Procopius in *Hist. Arcana* pag. 2. from whence it appears that he who was baptized was by name Theodosius, and by sect an Eunomian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that Epigramme on the History of Philostorgius, he was certainly by sect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the Inscription, written without question by some Catholick, who thought no man could commend the History of Philostorgius but one of his own opinion. These contraditors of the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord, afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a general name Antidicomarianitæ. And from him S. Aug. Antidicomarianitæ appellati sunt Hæretici, qui Mariæ virginitati usque adeo contradicunt, ut affirmant eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam, de Hæres. condemned under that name by the sixth General Council, *Act. 11*. The same were called by the Latines Helvidiani from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian) whose name is most made use of, because refused by S. Hierome. He was followed by Iovinian a Monk of Millan, as S. Hierome testifieth, though S. Augustine delivereth his opinion otherwise, Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam. And Bonosus a Bishop in Macedonia, referred by the Council of Capua to the judgement of Anysius Bishop of Thessalonica, was condemned for the same, as appeareth by the 79. Epistle of S. Ambrose, written to Theophilus and Anysius. Sane non possumus negare de Mariæ filius iure reprehensum, meritoque vestram Sanctitatem abhorruisse, quod ex eodem utero virginali, ex quo secundum carnem Christus natus est, alius partus effusus sit. This is the Catalogue of those by the Ancients accounted Hereticks for denying the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord. b *Matth. 1. 25.*

B b

of

† Μέχρη τοῦ
καὶ τοῦ οὐκ
ἐκείνου
ἀναγκασίᾳ ἢ
παρθένῳ, τὸ δ'
ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπολυ-
τῇ καὶ μόνῃ
τῇ ἁγίᾳ τῇ
ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἀδελ-
φῇ. S. Basi.
Hom. de Nati.

* For so the
Greek Church
always called
her ἀειπαρθέ-
νη, and from
them the La-
tine Semper-
Virgo.

a Ezech. 44. 2.

† First we read
in the time of
Origen, that
somedid main-
tain the Virgi-
nity of Mary
no longer then
to Christ's Na-
tivity. In tan-
tam nescio

were unheard of in the law, because the Original * Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction, and in the Law it self carrieth with it a cleare interpretation, *a Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the wombe among the children of Israel both of man and beast it is mine.* The apertion of the wombe * determineth the first-born; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation, *b Those that are redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem; no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption.* Being then *they brought* our Saviour to *Jerusalem to present him to the Lord,* As it is written in the law of the Lord, *Every male that openeth the wombe shall be called holy to the Lord;* it is evident he was called the *first-born of Mary* according to the notion of the law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor proveth the Mother to have any other off-spring.

Indeed, they thirdly object, it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord, *He went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren*: and while he talked unto the people, *his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him*. But although his Mother and his brethren be nam'd together, yet they are never called the sons of his Mother; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his Mother brought forth any other children. 'Tis possible Joseph might have children before *Mary* was espoused to him; and then, as he was reputed and called our Saviour's father, so might they well be accounted and call'd his brethren, as the † ancient Fathers, especially of the Greek Church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that Joseph had any off spring, because the language of the *Jewes* includeth in the name of *brethren* not only the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such persons allied unto the blessed Virgin. *¶ We be brethren* said Abraham unto Lot; when Abraham was the son of Terah, Lot of Haran, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew, and, as elsewhere properly stiled, ^d *the son of his brother*. ^e *Moses called Mishaël and Elzaphan the sons of Uzziael the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come neer, carry your brethren from before the Sanctuary*; whereas those brethren were Nadab

* **בכורם.**

a Exod. 13. 2

* **Definitiv**
fern o Dei
quid sit Pri-
mogenitum ; omne, in-
quit, quod
aperit vul-
vam. *S. Hier.*
adv. Helv.
bNum. 18. 16.
Luk 2. 22, 23.

Iohn 2. 12.

Matth. 12. 46.

† Origen first delivereth it on S. Mat. and Eusebius sheweth his opinion. speaking of S. Iames the Brother of our Lord, Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1. Τὸν δὴνα καὶ Ἰακώβον τὸν Κυρίου ἀγαπῶν ἀδελφόν, ἐπὶ δὴ καὶ ἔτερον Ἰακώβον ἀνθρώπου πάλιν τὸν Χριστῶν.

πατρὶς ὁ Ἰωσήφ. Some read, as it is set forth by R. Stephan. But in my book collated with an ancient MS. οὐ δὲ καὶ εἶπε ὡς ἔν τῷ Ἰωσήφ. τῷ ἱερομάρτυρι οἰοεὶ πατέρι τῷ Χριστῷ. Which is much more plain, for εἰρημολογῶν πατὴρ is nothing so pertinent in this particular, as ὡς ἔν. So Epiphanius, "Ὁ γὰρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ εἶπε ὡς ἔν τῷ Ἰωσήφ ὁ γυναικὶς τῷ Ἰωσήφ ὁ πατὴρ Μαρίας. Hæref. 29. and Hæref. 42. speaking of the rest, he calls them πατὴρ ὡς Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι αὐτῶν αὐτῶν γυναικὶς. Thus S. Hilary, Homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ auctoritatem, quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum, quasi Maria illi fuisset, & non potius Joseph ex priore conjugio suscepti. Com. in Matth. cap. 1. Thus also S. Ambrose de Virg. and generally all the Fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterward, S. Chryf. S. Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and Nicephorus. These all seem to have followed an old Tradition which is partly still continued in Epiphanius, "Ἐπεὶ ἔειπεν ὁ Ἰωσήφ τὸν μὲν πατέρα αὐτοῦ γυναικὶς ἐν τῷ οὐκῷ Ἰδοὺ" καὶ καλεῖται αὐτὸν αὐτὴ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἀδελφαῖς, ἀδελφὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ. Hæref. 78. The first of these six children was James: καὶ αὐτὸν τὴν γυναικὶν πατὴρ Ἰωσήφ καλεῖται αὐτὸν, εἴτα καὶ αὐτὸν Συμῶν, ἑτεῖα Ἰδαὶς: καὶ οὗο θυγατέρας, ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμην καλεῖται. Thus had the Greeks a different relation of the sons and daughters of Joseph, and of the order of their generation. Whose authority I shall conclude with that of Iobn Occorom. l. 9. "Ἐπεὶ πατέρα καὶ ἀδελφὸς ἦν τῷ ὀνομασθῶ τὸν ἀπατέρα, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ πομπῶν τῶν ἐκείνου, ἀλλ' ἐὰν τὰς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ διαλεχόμενους τοῖς τῷ γὰρ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ταῖς παιδὶς. Phot. Biblioth. 222. And that of Amphilochius Unior. Orat. in Deip. "Ἦλπισσαν δὲ σποτὶ καὶ ὅτι ὁ Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς, καὶ οὗο μαρτυρεῖ ὁ ἑκαθὼς λέγων, καὶ τῷ περὶ διδοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀληθὲς, γερουσιαστικὴν Ἰδαὺς καὶ πατρί τῷ ἀφῶμον. Οὗ καὶ Κυρίῳ ἑωσὶ Χριστῷ δίδας καλεῖται. c Gen. 13. 8. d Gen. 12. 5. e Lev. 10. 4.

B b 2

and

Gen. 29. 12.

† The first, I conceive, who returned this answer, was S. Hierome, in a Treatise written in his youth at Rome against Helvidius; wherein after a long discourse of several acceptions of Brethren in the Scriptures, he thus concludes: Restat igitur ut fratres eos intelligas appellatos cognatione, non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non natura: quomodo Lot Abraham, quomodo Jacob Laban

est appellatus frater. And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, he says 'twas grounded merely upon an Apocryphal History. Com. in Mat. cap. 12. Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suscipiuntur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierculam confingentes. Indeed Origen himself, followed in this particular by the Greek Church, did confesse no teste, who tells the Authors from whom that interpretation first arose, Fratres autem Jesu putabant nonnulli esse, ex traditione Hebræorum sumpta occasione, ex Evangelio quod titulum habet juxta Petrum, aut ex libro Jacobi, filios Joseph ex priorē uxore, quæ convixerat ipsi antequam duceret Mariam, in Mat. 13. 55. This Jacobus mentioned by Origen is the same with him whom Eusebius mentions in Hexameron, Ἰακώβος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας ταυτέστιν ἡ μητέρα. where he reckons Joseph inter the Christians: and Epiphanius calls Ιακώβος Ἐβραῖος. S. Hierome therefore observing that the former opinion of Joseph's sons was founded merely upon an Apocryphal writing, and being ready to assert the Virginity of Joseph as well as Mary, first invented the other solution in the kindred of Mary, as founded not only in the language but also testimony of the Scriptures. Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suscipiuntur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierem confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus matertera Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris & Joseph & Judæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat, S. Hieron. in Matth. 12. 49. After S. Hierome S. Aug. embraced this opinion. Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ, fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos & cognationis propinquos. In Job. Tract. 28. item Tract. 10. & contra Faustum l. 22. 35. Although therefore he seems to be indifferent, in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, Iacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus debet intelligi: yet because this Exposition was written while he was a Presbyter, and those before mentioned after he was made a Bishop, therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and S. Hierome's authority hath bin generally since received in the Latine Church. a Mat. 13. 55. * From this place Helvidius argued, Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominati, & eosdem esse fratres Domini, filios Mariæ. S. Hier. advers. Helv. And from the next he concluded, Ecce Iacobus & Iosès, filii Mariæ, quos Iudæi fratres appellaverunt. b Mat. 27. 56. c Mark 16. 1. † Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, Quam miserum erit & impium de Mariâ hoc sentire, ut cum aliæ feminæ curam sepulture habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!

mother

10. 19. 25.

Matth. 27. 56.

Mark 15. 40.

Matth. 28. 1.

†Iacobus qui
appellatur
frater Domi-
ni, cognom-
ento Iustus,
ut nonnulli
existimant,
Ioseph ex al-
lia uxore, ut
autem mihi
videtur, Mari-
æ sororis
Matris Do-
mini, cujus
Ioannes in
libro suo me-
minit, filius.
*S. Hieron. in
Catalogo.*

Sicut in sepulchro ubi positum est corpus Domini, nec antea nec postea mortuus jacuit: sic uterus Mariæ nec antea nec postea quicquam in mortale suscepit.
S. Aug. in Iob. Tract. 26.

† *ἡμετέρας*.
* Tantum ad
nativitatem
carnis ex se
dedit, quan-
tum ex se for-
minæ eden-
dorum cor-
porum susce-
ptis origini-
bus impen-
dunt. *S. Hil.*

proper

1. 70 de Trim. † That is by a proper conception $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$, the Syriac in one word ܡܬܬܠܝܕܬܐ ventrefeere. So the LXX. translated the simple $\text{ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ πατρὸς}$. As therefore $\epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ expresses a proper generation, so doth $\epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ a proper conception. According to that expression of Gregory Nazianzenus, $\text{ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ υἱοῦ}$ $\epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ Ep. ad Cledon. i Heb. מִן הַבֶּטֶן a Luke 1. 42. b Matth. 1. 18. c Luke 2. 5. $\text{ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ πατρὸς}$ d Luke 11. 27. $\text{ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ πατρὸς}$.

and in the answer to the same Question, *πρόματι ἀγίῳ ἡδρασά, καὶ συνέπει τῇ δυνάμει τῷ ὁψίον ἢ ἀέμυνε* *Θεὸν καὶ τὸ Θεῶ, Μαρία ἡ Θεοτόκος, καὶ παρθένος.* and again, *ἡ τωσὶ λέγει καὶ θεὸς τῷ ἡμεῶν Θεῷ.* In the Answer to the 7. Question. *ὁ δὲ τὸ φέρειν εἰς Ἀιγύπτου τὸν Ἰσὺν ἅμα τῇ Θεοτόκῳ Μαρίᾳ ἐν ἀρχαῖς φέρειν τῷ καθαρῶν ἡμῶν.* and so often. Nay yet before him Origen did not only use, but expound at large the meaning of that title *Θεοτόκος*, in his first tome on the Epistle to the Romans, as Socrates and Liberatus testifie. Well therefore did Antiochus Bishop of Antioch urge the ancient Fathers against Nestorius, calling it *θεοφόρον ὄνομα καὶ πρεμιμὴν πολλοῖς τοῖς Πατέρι, and again πολλοῖς τοῖς πατέρι καὶ Συνέτοι, καὶ ῥεφόν, καὶ ἰσθόν.* Τὸ το γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα, sayes he, *ἡδεῖς τοῖς Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν διδασκάλων παρήταται, εἰ τε γὰρ χρυσόσθου ἀνὰ πολλοὺ καὶ ὁσίον καὶ εἰ τε καὶ χρυσόσθου ἐν ἱστορίῳ τοῦ χρυσόστομου.* Concil. Ephes. p. I. c. 25.

para. which being a compound title, begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into it's parts by the Latines, and so the Virgin was plainly nam'd the † Mother of God.

The Necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of the Virgin Mary*, will appear both in respect of her who was the Mother, and of him who was the Son.

In respect of her, it was therefore necessary, that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to so high a dignitie. It was her own predication, *a from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed*; but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out *with so loud a voice, Blessed art thou among women*, when Christ was but newly conceiv'd in her wombe; what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that Mother with him? * Farre be it from any Christian to derogate from that special priviledge granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the *Mother of our Lord*, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive Church: † Let her be honoured and esteem'd, let him be worship'd and ador'd.

† Although *Θεοτόκος* may be extended to signifie as much as the mother of God, because *τίς τις* doth sometimes denote as much as *ἡ γὰρ*, and therefore it hath been translated *Dei Genitrix*, as well as *Dei para*; yet those ancient Greeks which called the Virgin *Θεοτόκος*, did not call her *μῆτηρ Θεοῦ*. But

the Latines translating *Θεοτόκος*, *Dei genitrix*, and the Greeks translating *Dei genitrix* *Θεὸς μῆτηρ*, they both at last called her plainly the Mother of God. The first which the Greeks observed to stile her so was Leo the Great, as was observed by Ephraim Patriarch of Theopolis; whose words have been very much mistaken by two learned men, Dionysius Petavius, and Leo Allatius, who have produced them to prove that he thought Leo Magnus was the first man which ever used the word *Θεοτόκος*. A strange error this must needs appear in so great a person as a Patriarch, and that of the Greek Church; and indeed not imaginable, considering how well he was versed in those controversies, and how he compared the words of Leo with those of the ancient Greek Fathers, and particularly of S. Cyril. His words are these in his Epistle ad Zenobium, *Πατὴρ ἐν ἀγίοις Ἀθανάσιος ἰδὼν ἰδιωτὴς λέγειν, ὅς μῆτηρ Θεοῦ ἵσεν ἡ ἀγία Θεοτόκος, ἥ καὶ αὐτὴ πατέρα διακονοῦσι ῥήμασι μὴ τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς; That is, Leo was the first who in plain terms called the *Θεοτόκος*, that is Mary, the Mother of God, whereas the Fathers before him spake not the same in expresse words. Petavius and Allatius have clearly mistaken the proposition, making the subject the predicate, and the predicate the subject, as if he had first called the mother of God *Θεοτόκος*, whereas he is said first to call the *Θεοτόκος* Mother of God, as appeareth by the article added to the subject, not to the predicate. But if that be not sufficient, his meaning will appear by another passage to the same purpose, in his Epistle ad Synclericum, *Ὅτι μῆτηρ Θεοῦ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀνέειπεν, ἐπεὶ λέγει καὶ ὁ ὁδὸν μαρτυροῦν, ἵνα ἡ μῆτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μὴ ἴδῃ ὡς καὶ σαρκεγενὴς ἦ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τῷ λόγῳ πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Πάπας ἀνέειπεν.* Therefore as he took the Lord, and God to be synonymous; so he thought Elizabeth first stiled Mary the mother of God, because she called her the mother of her Lord, and after Elizabeth Leo was the first who plainly stiled her so, that is, the mother of God. And that we may be yet further assured of his mind, he produceth the words of Leo the Pope in his Epistle to Leo the Emperour; *Αναθεματίζω Νεστόριον, ὁ τὴν μακαρίαν καὶ Θεοτόκον Μαρίαν εἰς τὸ Θεῶ, ἀνθρώπου ὃ μόνον τσάου τῇ μῆτι.* The sentence which he translates is this; *Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitricem.* Epist. 97. c. 1. Where plainly *genitrix Dei* is translated *μῆτηρ Θεοῦ*, and *Θεοτόκος* is added by Ephraim out of custome in the subject, being otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek Church they termed the blessed Virgin *Θεοτόκος*, and the Latines from them, *Dei genitrix*, and *mater Dei*, and the Greeks from them again *μῆτηρ Θεοῦ*, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice if other Latines, who stiled her so before him. a Luke I. 48. *Non aquanda est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem.* Author lib. de singular. Clericorum. * Absit ut quisquam S. Mariam divinæ gratiæ privilegiis, ut speciali gloria fraudare conetur. 1^a H. Maria ἐν τῇ, ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐκείνου. Ἐν τῇ ἵστορία Μαρία, ὁ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ ἡ Τίς, καὶ ἡ ἀγία Πνεύματι ὁ Θεὸς ἐκείνου. Τὴν Mariam μὴ εἰς Θεογονίαν. Epiph. Hæres. 79. Ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἀγία καὶ τρεῖς ἑνότητες, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰς τὸ Θεογονίαν. ib.*

Heb. 2. 16.

Heb. 2. 14.

† Under that
notion did the
Ancient Jews
expect him, as
appeareth by
the Targum,
Cantic. 8. 1.

וכהניא זיכנא
אחורא מלכא
משיחא לכניסא
רישדאל ויכיר
לה בני ישראל
איתא חתא
עכנא לאח.

When the Mes-
sias shall reveal
himself, the
sons of Israel
shall say unto
him, Thou shalt
be unto us a
Brother.

* Hominis li-
beratio in u-
troque sexu
debut appa-
rere, Ergo,
quia virum
opostebat sus-
cipere, qui
sexus hono-
rabilior est,
conveniens
erat ut femi-
nei sexus li-
beratio hinc
appareret,
quod ille vir
de femina
natus est.

S. Aug. Quest.

1. 83. Nolite

vos ipsos con-

temnere, viri,

filius Dei virum suscepit:

nolite vos ipsas

contemnere, feminae,

filius Dei natus

ex femina est.

Idem de Agone Christi.

a Heb. 4. 15.

Non cum in peccatis mater ejus in utero

aluit, quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit.

S. Aug. Tract. 4. in Iob. Ergo ecce Agnus Dei.

Non

habeat iste traducem de Adam; carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit.

Ibid.

Verbum caro factum in Similitudine carnis peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium

ferens ex traduce pravaricationis exortum. Ioan. 4. Epist. ad Constantinum.

† Levi in lum-

bis Abraham fuit secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam substan-

tiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine & visibilis corpulentia, & invisibilis ratio, utrumque

cucurrit ex Abraham vel etiam ex ipso Adam usque ad corpus Mariæ, quia & ipsum eo modo

conceptum & exortum est; Christus autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit,

ratio vero conceptionis ejus non à semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit. S. August. de

Gen. ad lit. l. 10. c. 19.

In respect of him, it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was *made*, or *begotten of a woman*, and consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. For he took not on him the nature of Angels, and therefore saved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are reserved in everlasting chains under darknesse unto the judgement of the great day. And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably condemned to the same condition, but that He took upon him the seed of Abraham. For being we are partakers of flesh and blood, we could expect no redemption but by him who likewise took part of the same. We could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our † Brother. And being there is but one Mediatour between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, we cannot be assured that he was the Christ, or is our Jesus, except we be first assured that he was a man. Thus our Redeemer the man Christ Jesus was born of a woman, that he might * redeem both men and women; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceived and born of such a woman, as was a most pure and immaculate Virgin. For as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us; so in that great similitude was as necessary, that he should be * without sin. Our passeever is slain, and behold the lamb that taketh away the sins of the world; but the lamb of the passeever must be without blemish. Whercas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a Virgin without any seminal traduction. Our high Priest is separate from sinners not only in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as † Levi was in the loins of Abraham, and paid tithes in him, and yet Christ, though the son of Abraham, did not pay tithes in him, but receive them in Melchizedec: so though we being in the loins of Adam may be all said to sin in him; yet Christ, who descended from the same Adam according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent, is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions; but he who is only from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediential power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that Virgin Mary which was espoused unto Joseph, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of David. For whatsoever promises were made of the Messias, were appropriated unto him,

As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of Abraham, so the seed of Abraham was next appropriated to the son of David. He was to be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God was to give unto him the throne of his father David. When Jesus asked the Pharisees, *what think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* they said unto him, the son of David. When Herod demanded of the chief Priests and Scribes where Christ should be born; they said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea, because that was the city of David, whether Joseph went up with Mary his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of David. After John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, Zacharias blessed the Lord God of Israel, who had raised up an horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant David. The woman of Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind that followed him, cried out, *have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David.* The very children out of whose mouths God perfected praise, were crying in the Temple, and saying, *Hosanna to the son of David.* And when the blind and dumb both spake and saw, all the people were amazed, and said, *Is not this the son of David?* Thus by the publick and concurrent testimonies of all the Jewes, the promised Messiah was to come of the house and lineage of David; for God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loynes according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne. It was therefore necessary we should believe that our Saviour was made of the seed of David according to the flesh: of which we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused unto Joseph, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy might be known.

Luke 1. 32.

Math. 22. 42.

Math. 2. 6.

Luke 2. 4.

Mat. 9. 27, 28.
22. 20, 30.Mat. 21. 15.
Mat. 21. 23.
Mark 11. 30.

Rom. 1. 3.

The Consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter branch of the Article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to professe, and being informed fully expresse what is the object of his Faith in this particular, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I assent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, that there was a certain woman known by the name of Mary, espoused unto Joseph of Nazareth, which before and after her espousals was a pure and unspotted Virgin, and being and continuing in the same Virginity, did by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost conceive within her wombe the onely-begotten Son of God, and after the natural time of other women, brought him forth as her first-born son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate Virgin; whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which was of the house and lineage of David, that he might sit upon his throne, and rule for ever more. And in this latitude I professe to believe in Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary.

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.

† Crucifixus
sub Pontio
Pilato, & se-
pultus. *Ruffi.*
in Symb. Cas-
sianus de in-
carn. Domini.
Credimus in
eum qui sub
Pontio Pila-
to crucifixus
est & sepul-
tus. *S. August.*
de Fide &
Symb. & de
Trinitat. l. i.
c. 14. Caput
nostrum Chri-
stus est, cru-
cifixum &
sepultum,
resuscitatum
ascendit in
coelum. Idem
in Psalm. 132.
Qui sub Pon-
tio Pilato
crucifixus est
& sepultus.
Max. Taurin.
Chrysol. Au-
seb. Gallie.
Τὸν ὡς Πόντιου
Πιλάτου σταυρω-
θέντα, ταφέντα.
Qui sub Pon-
tio Pilato
crucifixus est
& sepultus.
MSS. Armach.
And beside
these a wit-

His Article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of Christ's humiliation. For the first word of it, now generally speaking of his passion, in the most ancient Creeds was no way distinguish'd from his crucifixion; for as we say *suffer'd and crucified*, they onely † *Crucified under Pontius Pilate*: nor was his crucifixion distinguished from his death, but where we read *crucified, dead, and buried*, they onely *crucified and buried*. Because the chief of his sufferings were on the Crosse, and he gave up the Ghost there; therefore his whole passion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

But again, being he suffered not onely on the Crosse, being it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed tree, and yet not have dyed; therefore the Church thought fit to adde the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death as consequent, to his crucifixion.

To begin then with his passion in general. In those words, *he suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as Substantial, part as Circumstantial. The substance of this part of the Article consisteth in our Saviours Passion, *He suffered*: the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*.

Now for the explication of our Saviour's Passion, as distinct from those particulars which follow in the Article, more I conceive cannot be required then that we shew, *who* it was that suffered, *How* he suffered, *What* it was he suffered.

First, If we would clearly understand Him that suffered in his full relation to his Passion, we must consider him both in his Office, and his Person; as Jesus Christ, and as the onely-begotten Son of God. In respect of his Office we believe that he which was the Christ did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering Messiah. Of which that we may give a just account, First, we must prove that the promised Messiah was to suffer: for if he were not, then by professing that our Jesus suffer'd, we should declare he was not Christ. Secondly, we must shew that Jesus, whom we believed to be the Messiah, did really and truly suffer: for if he did not, then while we prov'd the true Messiah was to suffer, we should conclude our Jesus was not that Messiah. Thirdly, it will further be advantageous for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the Messiah were determin'd and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And fourthly, it will then be necessary to shew that our Jesus did truly suffer whatsoever was determin'd and foretold. And nesse without exception, Leo the Great, Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum & sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur. *Epist. 10. cap. 5. Afterwards the Passion was expressed: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus & sepultus, Euthymius Vvam. And the Death: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, & sepultus. Author lib. de Symb. ad catechum. Not but both these were expressed before in the Rule of Faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the crucifixion. Adv. Prax. c. 2. hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum, as Optatus. passus mortuus, & sepultus resurrexit. l. 1. And generally the Ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his suffering. For as Marcellus and S. Cyril have σταυρωθέντα & ταφέντα Eusebius and the Nicene Council to the same purpose have σταυρωθέντα onely in their Creeds. Which was further enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθέντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀνέστη.*

more then this cannot be necessary, to declare *Who* it was that suffered, in relation to his Office.

For the first of these, that the promised Meisias was to suffer, to all Christians it is unquestionable; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the Doctrine which S. Paul disseminated through the world was this, *that the Christ must needs have suffered.*

Mark 9.12.
Luke 24.26,
46.
Acts 17.3.

But because these Testimonies will satisfy onely such as believe in Jesus, and our Saviour himself did referre the disbelieving Jewes to the Law and the Prophets, as those who testified of him, we will shew from thence, even from the Oracles committed to the Jews, *how it was written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things; and how the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ.*

Mark 9. 12.
1 Pet. 1.11.

The fifty third Chapter of Esay is beyond all question a sad, but clear description of a suffering person: *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living.* But the person of whom that Chapter treateth, was certainly the Meisias, as we have † formerly prov'd by the confelion of the most ancient Jews, and may further be evidenced both from them, and from the place it self. For surely no mans soul can be made an offering for our sinnes, but our Saviour's: nor hath God laid on any man the iniquity of us all, but on our Redeemer. Upon no person but the Mesias could the chastisement of our peace be, nor with any stripes could we be heal'd but his. It is sufficiently then demonstrated by the Prophet, that the suffering Person whom he describes, was to be the Christ, in that he *bare our griefs, and carried our sorrows.*

† Pag. 96.
We shewed by the Authority of the Targum, the Bereshith Rabba, and the Midrash upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Iarchi, and Moses Alshech, that the ancient Rabbins did Interpret that chapter, of the Meisias; which might seem a sufficient acknowledgment.

This prediction is so clear, ever since the Serpent was to bruise the heel of the womans seed, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a redemption. But because this is the most considerable controversy between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by further Testimonies. In the Talmud, Cod. Sanhedrin, to the question, what is the name of the Meisiah? it is answered, חוריא the Leper. And the reason of the name is there rendered, שומא, because it is spoken in this Esay 53.4. Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, i. e. ענו. and because ענו is used of the Leprosy Levitic. 13.13. therefore from ענו they concluded his name to be a Leper, and consequently did interpret that place of the Meisias. In the Pesikta it is written, הוציא ה' את נשמתו שמואל המשיח God produced the soul of the Meisias, and said unto him, Wilt thou redeem my sons after 6000 years? He answered, I will. Wilt thou bear the chastisements to take away their sins? ונשא דמיתא דבתיא אבן הליינו הוא נשא as it is written Isa. 53.4. Surely he hath born our griefs. And he answered, I will bear them with joy. Which is a clear testimony, considering the Opinion of the Jews, that all souls of men were created in the beginning, and so the soul of the Meisias to suffer for the rest. The shift of the Jews turning these expressions off from the Meisias, and attributing of them to the People as to one, is something Ancient, for we finde that Origen was urged with that exposition in a disputation with the Jews. Μεμνημεν δὲ περὶ ἐν νυνὶ σφῶν τῶν λεγόντων παρὰ Ἰουδαίους σφῶς ἀξιοῦσιν ταῖς σοφιστικαῖς ταύταις χηροῖς λέγειν· ἰδ' οἱ ἰσχυροὶ ὁ Ἰουδαῖος, ταῦτα προσεσφῶνται ἀπὸ σφῶν ἐν τῷ ὄντι καὶ προβάλλουσιν ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ καὶ πλῶντος, ἵνα πάλιν σοφιστῶσι λέγοντες ὅτι σφῶν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν τοῖς πολλοῖς ὄνομασι. Thus the Jew interpreted those places, Isa. 52.14. his village was so marred more then any man. 52.15. that which had not been told them shall they see. 53.3. A man of sorrow and acquainted with griefe, and applied them to the people of Israel in their dispersions. But Origen did easily refuse him by retorting other places of the same Prophecy, as 53.4. Surely he hath born our griefes and carried our sorrows. Vers. 5. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, and with his stripes are we healed. Σαφὲς γὰρ, says he, οἱ ἐν τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις ῥυπαροὶ, καὶ ἰαθέντες ἐν τῷ τῶν Σαπφῶς παρορίσῳ εἶναι δὲ τὸν λαόν ἐμῶν, εἶπε καὶ ὁ δὸς τὴν ἰσχυρὰν ταῦτα λέγειν. But especially he confounded the Jew with those words of the 8 Verse. Μαλιστα δὲ ἰδὲ σαφῶς ὁρίσκειν δὸς τῶν σαπφῶν λέγειν τὸ, Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἡχθῶν εἰς δαίμονα. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ λαὸς κατὰ ἐμῶν εἰσὶν οἱ σαρφωτὸν ἰσχυρῶν πᾶσι δὸς τῶν ἀνομιῶν τῶν ἡμῶν τὸ ὄνομα λέγειν ἡχθῶν εἰς δαίμονα, εἰ μὴ ἡμεῖς μὴ σαρφῶν τῶν λαῶν τὸ ὄνομα· οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰ μὴ Ἰουδαῖος χηρός; Origen. adv. Celsum. lib. 1.

tions, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the distinct economies, which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to dy, and another to triumph, but that the true Messias was both to triumph and to dy, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the raggs of our infirmity before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquer'd, and the other to be victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first Assertion remaineth firm, The Messias was to suffer.

Secondly that Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, did suffer we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it; the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so farre from being denied, that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrowes and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sins, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the Annals of times, if the writings of his Apostles, if the death of his Martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles, if the scoffs of the Jews be testimonies, Jesus suffered. Nor was there ever any which thought he did not really and truly suffer, but † such as withall irrationally pretended he was not really and truly man.

Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgement of this truth, we shall further shew that the promised Messias was not onely engaged to suffer for us, but by a certain and expresse agreement between him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determin'd, in order to the Redemption it self which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved, was before his

† Those which were called by the Greeks *Λοκνται*, and *Φαντασται*, who taught that Christ was man onely putative, and came into the world onely in

phantasmate, & consequently that he did onely putative pati. These were called *Λοκνται*, not from their Author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things onely *ἐν δοκείᾳ*, in appearance, not reality. As Clemens Alexandrinus, *Τὸν εἰρηναῖον αἰ μὴν ἀπὸ δόγματι τῶν ἰδρυόντων προσηγορεύον*, αἰς τὴν *Λοκνταίαν*. Strom. l. 7. viz. *ὅτι δοκῶντες Χριστὸν μετὰ τὴν αἰνότητα ἠγάσαντο*. Id. l. 6. Neque in Phantasia, id est, absque carne, sicut Valentinus asserit, neque de thesi, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus. Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. cap. 2. Where. for de theli, I suppose we should read *δοκῶντες*. The Original of this train of Hereticks is to be fetch'd from Simon Magus, whose assertion was, Christum nec venisse, nec à Judæis quicquam pertulisse. S. Aug. de Heres. Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, se in Filii persona putative apparuisse, and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews; *ἀναβέβηκε μὲν πατρὸς θέναι, ἀλλὰ δὲ δοκῶντες μόνον*. Damasc. de Heres. Now what Simon Magus said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed affirm'd of Christ. As Saturninus, who taught Christum in substantia non fuisse, & phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse, Tertul. de Præsc. adv. Heret. cap. 46: vide Epiph. mutilum, Her. 23. c. 1. And Basilides, who deliver'd, *εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν φαντασίαν ἐν τῇ αἰνότητι*, καὶ ὅτι *ἐν δόγματι*, καὶ δὲ *ἀπὸ δόγματι* εἰρηναίου... ἐπεὶ ἰσχυρὸν φάσκον πατρὸς θέναι, ἀλλὰ Σίμωνα τὸν Κυρηναῖον. Epiph. Her. 24. c. 3. A Judæis non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus. S. Aug. Her. 4. Thus the Valentinians, particularly Marcus, the Father of the Marcossian Hereticks. Marcus etiam nescio quis hæresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, & Christum non vere sed putative passum asseverans. S. Aug. Her. 14. Thus Cerdon. Christum in substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronunciat, nec omnino passum, sed quasi passum. Tert. Præsc. c. 51. Christum ipsum natum ex foemina, neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passionem. S. Aug. Her. 21. And the Manichees who taught Christum non fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuisse; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem mentiretur, Idem Her. 46. whom therefore

coming

coming in the flesh revealed to the Prophets, and written by them, in order to the reception of the Messias, and the acceptation of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the Messias was to undergo for us was predetermined & decreed, appeareth by the timely acknowledgement of the Church unto the Father; *Of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed; both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together; for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.* For as when the two goats were presented before the Lord, that goat was to be offered for a sin-offering, upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the High Priest, and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to dye: so the hand of God is said to have determin'd what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering. And well may we say that the hand of God as well as his counsel determin'd his passion, because he was deliver'd by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.

And this determination of Gods counsel was thus made upon a Covenant or Agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the Covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another Covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is express'd, *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days;* partly by the Apostle, *Then said I, loe I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.* In the Condition of making his soul an offering for sin we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptation, *loe I come to do thy will, O God,* we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour's passion was made by Covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered.

And as the sufferings of the Messias were thus agreed on by consent, and determin'd by the counsel of God, so they were revealed by the spirit of God unto the Prophets, and by them delivered to the Church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the prophecies spoken by God in the mouthes of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. S Paul's Apology was clear, that he said none other things but those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come; that Christ should suffer. The Prophets said in expresse terms that the Messias, whom they foretold, should suffer: Moses said so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the Passeeover to be slain, he said that Shiloh was the lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brasen Serpent up in the wilderness, he said, the Son of man should be lifted up upon the Crosse. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must dye for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of holies on the day of Atonement, he said, Christ our High Priest should

should never enter through the vail into the highest heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternal counsel of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of that counsel, either in expresse predictions or ceremonial representations, we shall clearly see the truth of our third Assertion, that the sufferings of the Promised Messias were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agree'd, determin'd and revealed as belonging to the true Messias, were undergone by that Jesus of Nazareth whom we believe to be the Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he out went not, never prediction of any passion which he fulfill'd not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approach'd, he said to his Apostles, *Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.* When he delivered them the blessed Sacrament, the commemoration of his Death, he said, *Truely the Son of man goeth as it was determined.* After his resurrection, he chastised the dulnesse of his Disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion, that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions; saying unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffer'd these things, and to enter in to his glory?* After his assertion, S. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies, and saw his sufferings; *Those things which God before had shew'd by the mouth of all his Prophets that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* Whatsoever therefore was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets, concerning the sufferings of the Messias, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be, and worship, as the Christ. Which is the fourth and last Assertion propounded to expresse our Saviour's passion in relation to his Office.

Luke 18. 31.

Luke 22. 22.

Mat 26. 54.

Luke 24. 25.

26.

Acts 3. 18.

Having considered him that suffered in his Office, we are next to consider him in his Person. And being in all this Article there is no person expressly named, or described; we must look back upon the former, till we find his description and his name. The Article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction referres us to the former, where we find him named Jesus, and described the *only begotten Son of God.*

Now this Son of God we have already shewed to be therefore truly called the *only begotten*, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternal Son, so also the eternal God. Wherefore by the † immediate coherence of the Articles, and necessary consequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead and buried. For it was no other person which suffered under Pontius Pilate, then he which was born of the Virgin Mary; he which was born of the Virgin Mary, was no other person then he which was conceived by the Holy Ghost; he which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was no other person then our Lord; and that our Lord, no other then the *only Son of God*: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that the *only son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate.* That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulnesse

† This is that inseparabilis connexio in the Creed, which Cassianus urgeb so much against Nestorius, de Incarn. l. 6.

conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity: nor can that † infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in it's intrinsecal and essential perfections. * If the bright rayes of the Sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the least infirmity by any union with humanity? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the divine nature, as to conceive it capable of any diminution; or so mean esteem of the essence of the Word, as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh be took; nor yet so groundlesse an estimation of the great mystery of the Incarnation, as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian Hereticks, whom the Church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion, that all the sufferings of our Mediatour were subjected in his humane nature.

And now the onely difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the Person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we professe the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and humane nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For † hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one, are given to the other; and that upon good reason. For being the same individual person is by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth, that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *a man is God*: because in this particular, he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the Incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably, that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the humane nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by vertue of the same Incarnation it is also proper to say, *a man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge, that all the essential attributes of the divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and

Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly deliver'd. This Phœbadius (the first of the Latine Church who wrote against the Arians,) chargeith them with. Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum vultis videri; ut etiam unius vestrum, id est Epistola Potami, quæ ad Orientem & Occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit, carne & Spiritu Christi coagulatis per sanguinem Mariæ, & in unum corpus redactis, passibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impassibilem satis constat. Lib. adv. Arianos, c. 7. And again: Non ergo est spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod illi volunt egregii Doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus & Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permixtione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilem volunt dici, ne ex impassibili credatur. Cap. 8. Μάτην δὲ Ἀρειανὸν φαντάζοντα, ὡς καὶ μόνον ὑπονοήσαντος ἀεικαίῳ τῷ Σολίμῳ. τὴν δὲ τῷ πάθῳ ἰόντι οὐκ τὴν ἀπαθὴν διότι ἀναφύγναι αὐτῷ. S. Athan. lib. de incarn. Of this S. Hilary is to be understood. Sed eorum omnis hic sensus, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui asserunt non de æternitate prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ substantiæ extitisse, sed ex nullo illum qui omnia creavit effectum, ut assumptus nihilo sit, & corpus ex opere, & confirmatus ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione. Can. 31. in Mat. Where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the onely true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever sin e.

† Per indissolubilem unitatem Verbi & carnis, omnia quæ carnis sunt ascribuntur & Verbo, quomodo & quæ Verbi sunt prædicantur in carne. Orig. in Ep. ad Rom. Διὰ τὴν ἀμείῃ ἑνότητα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπου φύσεως, αἰτημαθῆναι τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπου τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τὸ θεοῦ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὴν ἐνότητα. Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Theoph. Χρὶς μόνος εἶναι αὐτῷ ὡς ἡ φύσις καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ὀνόματι. Theodor. Dial. 3.

D d

pro.

† Τοῦ γὰρ φύσει ἀθάνατον, καὶ ἀ-
παύσιον, αὐτῷ
τῷ θεῷ ἑστίν, ὃ
συνάλλακτον
τῇ τῷ θεῷ φύσει,
ὅταν ἐν ἐκείνῃ
κατ' οὐκ ἐκείνην
ἵσταται. Greg.
Nyss. Epist.
* Ὡς αὖτ' ἡ ἰα-
κὼς φασὶν περὶ τοῦ
τε ἀκρίτου τοῦ
πάντα πληροῦ
καὶ ὁμοῦ τῶν
καρῶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ
ἐστὶ ἰσχυρῶς
καὶ πολλὸν πλέον
ἢ ἀνθρώπου. τῷ
θεῷ δὲ ὁμοῦ
αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπου
ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπου
ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπου
ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπου.
Euseb. Demon.
Evang. l. 4.
c. 13.

‡ This danger
is the rather to
be unfolded,
because it is
not generally
understood.
The Heresy of
Arian as it
was condemned
by the Council
of Nice, is
known to all.
But that he
made the na-
ture of the

properly God, to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the humane nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible, and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly dye. And this is the only true communication of properties.

† called by the
Schools ordina-
rily Commu-
nicatio idio-
matum, by the
ancient Greek
Divines ὁμι-
όεως, and
sometimes
Ἀντιστάσε-
ως.

Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the Divinity of Christ were passible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence, and omnipresence, but because the same God the Son, was also the Son of man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal: mortal as the son of man, in respect of his humanity; eternal as the Son of God, in respect of his divinity. The sufferings therefore of the Messiah were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the humane nature was conjoynd to the divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoynd: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the Person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God, yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions, Who it was that suffered; in respect of his Office, the Messiah, in respect of his person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, but in his humanity, which he assumed clothed with our infirmities.

Our next enquiry is, What this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this Article: which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not Governour of *Judea* long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking then upon the sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the Gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And being we have already shew'd his passion was wholly subjected in his humane nature, being that nature consisteth of two parts, the Soul and Body, it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

For the first, as we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part; so we acknowledge that he took a true and real body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ really and truly humane, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal

mortal body : and though now the same body exalted above the highest heavens, by vertue of it's glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was cloath'd with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it onely liable to those internal weakneses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connatural to the parts of our body; so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense, and grievous was that pain, which those scourges produc'd, *when the plowers plowed upon his back, and made long their furrows*: the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary thorns did not onely expresse the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which open'd his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead: but the nails which pierc'd his hands and feet, made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the Body of the Son of man truly *suffer* the bitterness of corporal pains and torments inflicted by violent external impressions.

And as our Saviour took unto him both parts of the nature of man, so he *suffered* in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompence of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness, sorrow and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented to us by the Prophet, *as a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief*; and the proper subject of that grief, he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his Disciples, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull even unto death*. Qui suscepit animam, suscepit animæ passionem. S. Ambros. de Fi. del. 2. c. 3.

We ought not therefore to question whether He suffered in his soul or no; but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffered; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure; yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God; and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The Evangelists have in such language expressed his Agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration of the bitterness of that passion. *He began to be sorrowfull*, saith S. Matthew; *He began to be sore amazed*, saith S. Mark; *and to be very heavy*, say Mat. 26. Mar. 14.

and all the parts of his body at the same time inflam'd with anguish and agony : well then might that melting produce a sweat, and that inflam'd and rarified blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

And as the Evangelists expressions, so the Occasion of the grief will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God layed on his own Son the iniquities of us all, and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was he grieved for the sins of us all. If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge, he understood all the sins of men for which he suffer'd, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the majesty and ingratitude against the goodness of God, which was contain'd in all those sins. If we look upon his absolute conformity to the will of God, he was inflam'd with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and most studious to preserve that right which was so highly violated by those sins. If we look upon his relation to the sons of men, he lov'd them all far more than any did themselves, he knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternal destruction on their souls and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved, as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those graces which were without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with the greatest habitual detestation to abhorre all sin : If we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law onely for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that grief what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?

Add unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once an heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any of the Saints of God; that he being *touch'd with the feeling of our infirmities*, might become a *mercifull High-priest, able and willing to succour them that are tempted*. Thus may we behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow, which was done unto him; *wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger*. And from hence we may and must conclude, that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoever he took; in his body, by internal infirmities and external injuries, in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shews us fully, (if it can be shewn) the third Particular propounded, What our Saviour suffered.

Heb. 2. 17, 18.

4. 15.

Lam. 1. 12.

That our Saviour did thus suffer, is most necessary to believe. First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his humane nature. For if he were not man, then could not man be redeemed by him; and if that nature in which he appeared were not truly humane, then could he not be truly man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation. When therefore we see our Saviour truly suffer, we know his Divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his humane nature, as the proper

proper subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, Surely that Mediator between God and man was truly man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified died.

Secondly, it was necessary Christ should suffer for the Redemption of lapsed man, and their reconciliation unto God, which was not otherwise to be performed then by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He therefore was by all his sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins. For Salvation is impossible unto sinners, without remission of sin: and remission in the decree of God impossible, without effusion of blood. Our Redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

*Psal. 110. 7.
Luke 24. 26.*

Thirdly, it behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternal happiness in the heavens both for himself the Head, and for the members of his body. *He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head.* Ought not Christ to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory? And doth he not by the same right by which he entered into it, conferre that glory upon us? The recompence of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he cheerfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly, it was necessary Christ should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy. For this purpose was he made a Sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High-priest: and therefore was he most unmerciful to himself, that he might be most merciful unto us.

Fifthly, it was necessary the Son of man should suffer, thereby to shew us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer. For if these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry? Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternal, his only-begotten Son, how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastiz'd, and appear to be in his paternal affection because they lye under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs only because coheirs with Christ; and we shall be kings only because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, *If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise*; and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, *If Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer.* And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the Direction in our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the Article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to professe when he makes this confession of his faith, *He suffered.* For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really perswaded within my self, and do make a sincere profession of this as a most necessary, certain, and

infallible

infallible truth, That the Onely-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truly suffer; not in his Divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the dayes of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: That as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from humane frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by external injuries; in his soul, by fearfull apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour suffered.

UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

After the substance of this part of the Article consisting in our Saviours passion, *He suffered*, followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which though the name of a stranger to the Common-wealth of Israel and the Church of Christ, is well preserved to eternal memory in the sacred Articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to dye in the fulnesse of time: so it concerns the Church to be assured of the time in which he dyed. And because the Ancient custome of the world was to make their computations by their Governours, and referre their historical relations to the respective times of their government; therefore, that we might be properly assured of the Actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings, (that is, the Actions which others did to him) the present Governour is nam'd in that form of speech which is proper to such historical or Chronological narrations, when we affirm that he suffered *† under Pontius Pilate*.

And because he not onely suffered under him as the present Governour, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a Judge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and

† *Ἐν Πόντιῳ Πιλάτῳ.*
Which words
are capable of
a double construction.

First, as they
are used by S.
Paul, 1 Tim.

6. 13. *Ἰησοῦ τῷ*

μαρτυρούμενος ἔνι Πόντιῳ Πιλάτῳ τὴν καλὴν ἐμολογήσας, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that is, standing before him as before a Judge. As of the same Person, Mat. 23. 14. *Καὶ ἰδὲ ἀναστῆς πρὸς τὸν ἡγεμόνα*, If this come to be tried before the Procurator. Thus Festus propounded it to S. Paul, Acts 25. 9. *βλέπεις κρινέμεθα ἢ ἡμεῖς*; and S. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, *ἐν τῷ βέλῳ καίσεως οὗτος εἰμι*. Thus Christ tells his Apostles Mar. 13. 9. *ἐν ἡμέρῳ καὶ βασιλείᾳ σταθίσονται*. And in this sense *ἐν* is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, *ἐν Πιλάτῳ* is under Pilate, that is, in the time of his Government, when and while he was Procurator of Iudæa: as *ἐν Ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα*, Luc 3. 2. and *ἐν Ἀδριανῷ τῷ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ*, Mar. 2. 26. which is also according to the custome and language of the Greeks; As *Καὶ Ἰακωβὸς ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ἰσχυρίσθη*, Marm. Arundel. *Οὗτοι ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Λαοκρονοῦ ἱερασταῶν Τριών. Πλάτ.* Epist. ad Archytam. And *ἐν τῷ βασιλεὺς Βασιδίου*, in this Kings reign, is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their 9. *Ἀρχὸς ἦν ὅς τις ἐπὶ τῷ ἔθνει*, because his name was us'd for the denotation of that yeare, and the phrase was usually *ἐν τῷ δέειν*, or *ἐν τῷ δέειν ἀρχόντος*. As I find it thrice in one place. *Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Ἰσχυρίσθη) ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ, Πλάτων δ' ἐν Ἀμφίπολιν, ἰφ' ἑ Περικλέους ἱταλῶντον.* Laert. in Platone. In the same manner did the Lacedæmonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the Priestesses of Iuno, *ἐν Χρυσοῦ* &c. *Ἀρχεὶ τῶν παντὶ κοινῇ δουρὶ δέοντι ὑποταγμένων, καὶ Ἀινουσίφορος ἐν Σπάρτῃ, καὶ Πυρροδῶς ἐν δύο μῶνας ἀρχόντος Ἀθηνῶν.* Thucyd. 1. 2. And as the Greeks in us refer'd all actions to the times of these Governours, so did the Jews under the Roman Government to the Procurators of Iudæa; as appeareth by Iosephus, who mentioning the first of that Office, Coponius, presently relates the resurrection of Iudas Galileus in this manner: *ἐν τῷ (Κοπιῳ) τῷ ἀντὶ Γαλιλαίας, Ἰούδας ὄνομα, εἰς δόξαν σὺν ἄλλοις τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.* De Bel. Iud. 1. 2. c. 12. then names his successor Ambivius, *ἰφ' ἑ Σαλαμὴ Ἰαμνὰς κραταίειναι.* after him Rufus, *ἰφ' ἑ δὲ τὸν Πιλάτῳ Καίσαρ.* Antiq. Iud. 1. 18. c. 3. And in the same manner in the Creed, *παθὼντα ἐν Πόντιῳ Πιλάτῳ* our Saviour suffered under Pontius Pilate, that is, at the time when he was Procurator of Iudæa; as Ignatius fully, *καὶ καμψὲς τῆς ἡγεμονίας Πόντιῳ Πιλάτῳ.* Epist. ad Magnesios.

con.

confirmation of the truth of our Saviours sufferings, to declare what hath been left and derived to our knowledge both concerning his Person and his office.

For the first, we find him described by two names; nor is any other name of his extant, although, according to the † general custome of the Romans, he should have three. The first of these two is * *Pontius*, the name descended to him from the original of his family, which was very ancient; the second *Pilatus*, as a cognominal addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same Original.

He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the Equestrian order, sent by Tiberius the Emperour to be a Governour of Judea. For about threescore years before our Saviours birth the Jews by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hyrcanus the High-priest, the reign of Herod, and his son Archelaus, the Roman State suffered the Jews to be ruled by their own laws and governours; yet when Archelaus was banished by Augustus, they received their Governours from the Roman Emperour, being made a part of the † Province of Syria belonging to his care. In the life of Augustus there was a Succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gracchus, and at his departure by *Pontius Pilate*.

The Office which this *Pilate* bare was the Procuratorship of Judea, as is most evident out of the History both of the * Romans, from

† *Pausanias speaking of the Romans*, Teia ἰππῶν ἑλπίστου καὶ ἡλικία ἰσχυρὰ ἔχοντες. And although *Dionodes and Plutarch* have observed, that even among the Romans there were some *diavuma*. yet the *Praenomen* was never omitted, as *Priscian* affirmed. Ex illo tempore consuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absq; praenomine. lib. 2. * *Pontius* and

Pilatus were his *Nomen* and *Cognomen*, in the same manner as *Julius* and *Cæsar* are describ'd by *Suetonius*: Non *Cæsar* & *Bibulo*, sed *Julio* & *Cæsar* Coss. actum scriberent, his eundem praeponebant, nomine atque cognomine. l. 1. c. 20. Thus without a *Praenomen* or *Agnomen* he is only known to us by his *Nomen* properly called, and his *Cognomen*. The nature of which two is thus described by the *Ancients*: *Nomen* proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod originem gentis vel familiae declarat, ut *Portius*, *Cornelius*; *Cognomen* est, quod uniuscujusque proprium, & nominibus gentilitiis subjungitur, ut *Cato*, *Scipio*. *Diomedes de Oratore* l. 1. *Nomen*, quod familiae originem declarat, ut *Cornelius*; *Cognomen*, quod nominis subiungitur, ut *Scipio*. *Charistius* l. 2. The first of these *Dionysius* calls τὸ κυρίον, καὶ πατρικόν, *Plutarch*, τὸ πρῶτον, & καὶ τὸ δεύτερον κυρίον: the second he calls μετὰ τὸν οὐρανόν, ἢ ἐν οὐρανῷ. Thus *Pontius* was his *Nomen* gentis or gentilitium, and *Pilatus* his *Cognomen*. As therefore *Pontius Aquila*, *Pontius Cominius*, *Pontius Herennius*, *Pontius Paulinus* &c. so also *Pontius Pilatus*. Wherefore in vain have some of the *Ancients* endeavoured to give an *Etymology* of these names, as they do of Greek and Hebrew names in the *Scripture*, and think thereby to expresse the nature or actions of them that bare the names. As *Isidorus Hispal.* Orig. l. 7. c. 10. *Pontius*, declinans concilium, utique *Judæorum*: accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, innocens ego sum à sanguine hujus justus. And *Eutychius Patriarch of Alexandria* deduced *Pontius* from an *Island* called *Ponta*, near to *Rome*. And *S. Jerome*, Quod significat nomen *Pilati*, i. e. malleatoris, i. e. qui domat ferreas gentes, ad *Mat.* 15. *Pilatus*, os malleatoris, quia dum *Christum* ore suo & iustificat & condemnat. more malleatoris utrinque ferit. *Isid.* ib. *Pontius*, declinans consilium; *Pilatus*, os malleatoris. *S. Ier. de nom. Hebraicis*, in *Luca*. & rursum in *Actis*. Where he lets us understand that these *Etymologies* were made from the Hebrew language, and makes an excuse, because the letter *P* is here taken for the Hebrew *Ph*, to which the *Latine F* more properly answers. Sed sciendum est quod apud *Hebræos P* litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum sonet: abusive igitur accipienda quasi per *F* literam scripta sint. Thus did they vainly strive to find an Hebrew Original, and that such an one as should represent the conditions of *Pilate*, when these two names are nothing else but the Roman *Nomen* and *Cognomen* of that Person. † *Tis* Ἀρχαὶς ἰδρυαῖς μεταφράσεως εἰς ἰσραηλῆας, *Ioseph*, de *Bel. Iud.* l. 2. c. 13. *Tis* ἡ Ἀρχαὶς ἡγεῖας ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ Συρίας, in *Antiq. Iud.* l. 17. c. 15. *Παῖς ὁ Κυρίου* εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ Συρίαν, *Ioseph*, ibid. l. 18. c. 1. * *Tacitus* speaking of the *Christians*, Author nominis ejus *Christus*, qui *Tiberio* imperitante per Procuratorem *Pontium Pilatum* supplicio affectus est. *Annal.* l. 15. And *Tertullian*, most skilful of their laws and customs, speaks thus of our Saviour; postremo oblatum *Pontio Pilato*, *Syriam* tunc ex parte Romana procuranti. *Apologet.* cap. 21. Whom *S. Cyprian* follows: Hunc Magistri eorum *Pontio Pilato*, qui tunc ex parte Romana *Syriam* procurabat, tradiderunt. *Adv. Demetr.* Thus also *Iosephus* for the Jews: *Παῖς ὁ Κυρίου* εἰς Ἰουδαίαν καὶ Συρίαν, καὶ *Tis* Ἀρχαὶς Πλάτων, de *Bel. Iud.* l. 2. c. 14. and *Philo*, *Πλάτων* ὁ ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Συρίᾳ, καὶ *Tis* Ἀρχαὶς Πλάτων, de *legat. ad Caium*. And therefore those words of *S. Luke*, c. 3. l. 1. καὶ *Tis* Ἀρχαὶς Πλάτων, were properly translated by the old Interpreter, procurante *Pontio* whom

Pilato Judæam. Thus Lucius Dexter ad annum Christi 28. Pontius Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur in Judæam. And Iustin Martyr most properly, Τὸ σταυροῦν τὴν Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τὸ ὑπομένει ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ τὴν ἑξῆς τὴν Τίτῳ Κλαύδιον Ἀντρέον, Apolog. 2. And again, speaking to the Emperours, by whom the Procurators were sent, καὶ Πιλάτου τὸ ὑπομένει παρ' Ἰουδαίᾳς ὑπομένει Ἀντρέον. And again, κατὰ τὸν ἱστορικόν. Ἰουδ' ἑξῆς τὸ σταυροῦν τὴν Ποντίου τὸ ὑπομένει Ἀντρέον τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, Dial. cum Tryph. As also Eusebius, ἀναλατρεῖται εἰσαλεῖ τὴν Τίτῳ Κλαύδιον Ἀντρέον τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς Τίτῳ Κλαύδιον Πιλάτον. Hist. l. i. c. 10. And S. Ieromes translation of his Chronicon: Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur. Thus it appears that Pilate of the Equestrian Order was properly Procurator, as that Office was ordinarily given to men of that Order, as Tacitus testifies: Cn. Iulius Agricola utrumque avum procuratorem Caesarum habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est: in vita Iul. Agric. Which is to be understood concerning the Imperial Provinces: for into those which were of the Provinces of the People, the Procurators sent by Caesar were of the Liberti. For the Emperour sent into all the Provinces his Procurators, but with this difference, as Dio observes, οἱ πάντες ὁμοίως τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἡαυτῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, τὰς μὲν ἐν τοῖς ἰσθμίοις, τὰς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, Hist. l. 53.

whom he received his authority, and of the Jews, over whom he exercis'd his dominion. But what was the Office of a † Procurator in those times, though necessary for our present purpose, is not so easie to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman Government. For before the Dominion of that City was changed from a Common-wealth into an Empire, there was no such publick Office in any of the Provinces, and particularly in Judæa none till after the banishment of Archelaus, some years after our Saviours birth. When Augustus divided the Provinces of the Empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care, and left the other to the inspection of the Senate; he sent together with the President of each Province, as the Governour in chief of the Province, a Procurator, whose office was, to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever was due to the Emperour, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their Jurisdiction, but such a care and disposal of the imperial Revenue: which they exercis'd as inferior and subordinate to the President, alwayes supreme Provincial Officer.

Now Judæa being made part of a Province of Syria, and consequently under the care of the Prefident of that Province, according to this institution, a particular Procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the Emperours revenue. And because the Nation of the Jews were alwayes suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Roman state, and the Prefident of Syria, who had the power of the sword, was forc'd to attend upon the other parts of his Province; therefore the Procurator of

† The Roman
Procurator is
ordinarily in
Greek Authors
expressed by
their *διοικητορ*
as the Glossa
Latino-Græc.
Procurator,
διοικητορ.

But yet they
are not of the
same latitude
in their use ;
ἐπιτετα-
comprehending
the notion of
Tutor, as well
as Procurator.
Hesye. ἐπιτε-
π. ο. ἐπιτετα-
τηριον, και ὁλος
της διδασκ, και
ὁρασαν. Gloss.
Vet. 'Επιτετορ,
Procurator,
tutor.

therefore was

asfled by the Greeks in both notions, whereof Procurator of the Latines is but one. And in the language of the Romans, he is a Procurator which undertakes to manage the business of another man. Procurator si negotium suscipit, fatis Aconius in Divinas. & Sex. Pompeius, Procurator absentis nomine actor fit; he to whom the care of another mans estate or affairs was committed. Gloss. Vet. *Εντολή, commissum*, & *Εντολή, procurator*. In correspondence to these Procurators of the affairs and estates of private Persons, there were made such as did take care in every Province of the Imperial revenue: who in respect of the Person whom they served, were called Procurators Cæsaris, or Augustales: in respect of the Countreys where they served, were termed Procuratores provinciales. Their office is best described by Dion Hist. l. 53. *Τὸς ἀντιπροσβους, ἢ τοὺς τὰς τιμὰς ἀντιπροσβους ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν καὶ περὶ τὰς τιμὰς σφοδρῶς ἀντιστοιχίας ἰσχυροῦ ἐξέχουσιν*. We call, sayes he, these ἀντιπροσβους, that is procurators, which receive the publick revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the Emperour. For they acted in his name; and what was done by them was accounted as done by the Emperour himself. Quæ acta gesta sunt à Procuratore Cæsaris, sic ab eo comprobantur, ac si à Cæsare gesta essent, Vlpian. l. 1. ff. As we read in Tacitus of the Emperour Claudius, Sæpius audita vox Principis, pacem vim rerum habendam à Procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si ipse statuisset, Annal. l. 12. and in Suetonius, Ut rata essent quæ Procuratores sui in iudicando statuerant, à Senatu precario exegit. The proper Office therefore of the Provincial Procurator was, to receive the Imperial revenue, and dispose of it as the Emperour commanded, and to all intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereunto, with such authority as if the Emperour himself had done them.

† This appear-
eth by Coponi-
us, the first pro-
per Procurator
of Iudæa, who
was brought in
by Quirinus
Præfes of Sy-
ria, when he
came to dis-
pose of the
goods of Arche-
laus, and to
reduce Iudæa
into the form
of a Province,
and adjoin it
to Syria. Of
this Coponius
Iosephus writ-
eth after this
manner: Κο-
νήσιος τῆ αὐτοῦ
(Κυρηνίου) Κυ-
ρηλατίμου τῆ
παρχίας τοῦ
ἐν τῇ ἰουδαίᾳ
ἐκείνου τῆ
ἐκείνου τῆ
ἐκείνου τῆ

Judæa was furnished with † power of life and death, and so administred all the power of the President, which was, as to the Jews, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the Providence of God, by which the full power of Judicature in Judæa was left in the hands of the Resident Procurator.

For by this means it came to passe that Christ, who by the determinate counsel of God was to dye, and by the prediction of the Prophets was to suffer in a manner not prescribed by the law of Moses, should be delivered up to a forraign power, and so suffer death after the customes of that Nation to whose power he was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jew was high to accuse and prosecute him, but the power of the Jews was not so high as judicially to condemn him. For although the Chief-Priests, and the Elders, and the Scribes ^a condemn'd him guilty of death; yet they could not condemn him to dye, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, ^b but deliver'd him up unto Pilate: and when he refusing said unto them, *take ye him, and judge him according to your law*, they immediately returned, *it is not lawfull for us to put any man to death*. The power of life & death was not in any Court of the Jews, but in the Romane Governour alone as supreme; and † therefore they answered him, it was *not lawfull*: not in respect of the law of Moses, which gave them both sufficient power, and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death; but in relation to the Roman Empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Fourty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the

That being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with Quirinus to govern the Jews with the supreme power. *Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. And yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of his power:* Τὸ δ' Ἀρχελάου γένος εἰς ἡμετέραν ἀποστασίαν. ὁ δὲ τῶν τῆς ἰουδαίας παρὰ Πωμαίων τῶν κατὰ Κομήσιον, καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἰουδαίαν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐκείνου, ἰδ. de Bel. Iud. l. 2. c. 11. When those parts which were under the command of Archelaus were reduced into a Province, Coponius was sent thither by the Emperour, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the Proconsular Provinces the Procurator of the Emperour had no power but in those things which belonged to the Exchequer; yet in those Provinces which were properly præsidiales the Procurator was often loco Præsidis. From whence in the Ancient Inscriptions we read of the same person, Procurator & Præfes Alpium, Procurator & Præfes provinciarum per Orientem, Procurator & Præfes provinciarum Sardiniae. It was often therefore so that the Procurator did Præsidis partibus fungi: as *Alpian l. 8. De officio Proconsulis*, In provinciam enim Præsidium provinciarum, nec aliter Procuratori Caesaris hæc cognitio iungitur, quam Præsidis partibus in provincia fungatur. And this is very necessary to be observed, because a Procurator barely such, not armed with the power of the Præfes provinciarum, had not the power of the sword. As *Antoninus to Valerius*; Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis nonungebatur, exilii tibi poenam non potuit irrogare, l. 9. *Cod. de penis*: and to *Heliodorus*; Procurator meus, qui vice Præsidis provinciarum non fungitur, sicut exigere poenam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita iudicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua non potest, l. 3. *C. Ubi causæ*. This was plain in the case of *Lucilius Capito* Procurator of Asia minor, who was called in question for exceeding his power, and deserted therein by *Tiberius*. Procurator Asiæ Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam dixit magna cum adseveratione Principis, non se jus nisi in servitia & pecunias familiares dedisse. Quod si vim Prætoris usurpasset, manibusque militum usus foret, spreta in eo mandata sua, audirent socios. *Tacit. Annal.* And *Dio* upon the said example observes in general, that the Procurators had no such power. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν ταῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀρχαῖς χρεῖσιν διακρίσεις πλὴν αὐτῶν τοῖς, ἃ τὰς νομομαχίας ἀποσείουσιν ἀλλ' ὅτι τῶν διαφορῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ τῶν νόμων ἐξ ἑαυτοῖς διακρίσεις διακρίσκει. But although the ordinary Procurators had no other power but to dispose of the revenue, and determine private causes; yet he which was vice Præsidis had the power of the Præfes: and such a Procurator was Pontius Pilate in Iudæa, as the others who preceded him also were. *a Mark 14. 64. b Iohn 10. 30, 31.* † I say therefore the Jews answered that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, because that power was taken out of their hands. For although *S. Augustine* think they thought it not lawful in respect of the Passover, Intelligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diem festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam coperant, *Traff. 14. in Ioan.* and *S. Cyril* be of the same opinion: yet others of the Ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate to be their want of power; as *Ammonius* most expressly, Τίνας ἔμελλεν αὐτὸν ἐκ ἀνέλεον, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸν Πλάτον ἡγεῖται; μέγιστον μὲν τὸ ποῦν τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑποτάσσεται, λαμβάνει ὑπὸ Πωμαίων τῶν παρχμάτων καμίνων; and upon those words in *S. Iohn*, ὅτι ἐκποσόντες τὰς ἀρχάς, ἵσταται γὰρ ὑπὸ Πωμαίων, εἶπον αὐτοῖς. So *Theophylact*, Ἀρροῦνται αὐτοὶ εἰς τὸ πραιτωρίον, ὃ γὰρ ἔχει αὐτοὶ ἐξουσίαν ἀνέλεον, ἀπὸ τῶν παρχμάτων ὑπὸ Πωμαίων καμίνων; and before him *S. Chrys.*

by him presented to the Senate; . secondly, by Records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government.

Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the Roman Governour in the expression of our Saviours passion, that thereby we might understand how it came to passe that Christ should suffer according to the Scriptures. The Prophets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose law and custome no man amongst them ever so dyed. Being then so great a Prophet could not dye but in Jerusalem, being the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the laws and customes of the Jews; it was necessary a Roman Governour should condemn him, that so the counsel of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one, and the customes of the other.

And now the advantage of this Circumstance is discover'd, every one may expresse the importance of it in this manner. I am fully perswaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the fullness of time God sent his Son, and that the eternal Son of God so sent by him did suffer for the sins of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Roman Emperour, and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate the Cæsarean Procurator of Judæa; who, to please the Nation of the Jews, did condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custome of that Empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the Prophecies, to dye a painfull and shameful death upon the Crosse. And thus I believe in Christ that suffered under Pontius Pilate.

The Ancient Romans were very desirous to preserve the memory of all remarkable passages which happened in the City: and this was done either in their Acta Senatus, or Acta diurna populi; which were diligently made, and carefully kept at Rome. In the same manner the Governours in the Provinces took care that all things worthy of remark should be written in publick Tables, & preserved as the

Acta in their government. And agreeably to this custome Pontius Pilate kept the Memoires of the Jewish affairs, which were therefore called Acta Pilati, in which an account was given of our blessed Saviour; and the Primitive Christians did appeal unto them in their disputes with the Gentiles as to a most undoubted testimony. Iustine Martyr urged them even unto the Roman Emperours: Καὶ ταῦτα ἐπὶ γένουσι δωαδὸν μαθεῖν ἐν ᾧ ὁ Πόντιος Πιλάτος ἡγουμένην ἔχων. And again, Ὅτι ἡ ταῦτα ἱστορεῖται, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Πόντιος Πιλάτος ἡγουμένην ἔχων μαθεῖν δωαδὸν. Apol. 2. And in the differences between the Christians, they were cited by both parties. As the Testaverdianus alleged them for their custome of the observance of Easter, as Epiphanius testifieth of them; ὅτι ἡ ἑσπερία δίδου Πιλάτου ἀρχὴν τὴν ἀρχιερέων διπλοῦν, ἐν οἷς ἡμεῖς, τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ καλῶν Ἀποστόλων τὴν Σατῶν πτωδῶν. And Epiphanius argueth the same Acta against them, but according to other Copies: Ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ἀνέγραφα ἐν ᾧ (lege Ἀκτων) Πιλάτου, ἐν οἷς σημειῖται, πᾶσι διακρίνεται καλῶν Ἀποστόλων τὸ πᾶν γένος. Heref. 50. These were also mentioned in the Acta S. Tarachi. Probi. & Andronici. cap. 9. Præses dixit, Inique, non scis, quem invocas Christum, hominem quidem fuisse factum sub custodia Pontii Pilati & punitum, cujus extant Acta Passionis. These Acta in the time of Maximinus were adulterated, and fill'd with many blasphemies against our Saviour, as appears by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 9. ἐκείνῳ σαρῶς ἀπὸ λανθάνου τὸ πλῆθος ἡνὶ κατὰ τὴν Σατῶν ἡμῶν ἀπομνημόνια χθὲς καὶ πρὶν διαδοικάντων. & l. 9. c. 5. Πλασθέντες δὲ τὰ Πιλάτου καὶ τὴν Σατῶν ἡμῶν ἀπομνημόνια πῶς ἡμεῖς κατὰ τὴν Χρῆστον βλασφημίας, γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσι διακρίνεται τὸν κατὰ αὐτὸν ἀρχόν.

WAS CRUCIFIED.

From the general consideration of our Saviours passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his Crucifixion, standing between his Passion, which it concludeth, and his Death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised Messias was to be crucified, that he which was designed to dye for our sins was to suffer upon the Crosse; secondly, to shew that our Jesus, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer, whatsoever was foretold, upon the Crosse; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contain'd in dying on the Crosse.

That the Messias was to be crucified, appeareth both by Types which did apparently foreshew it, and by Prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For thoughall those representations and predictions which the forward

least mention or footstep of them in the Catena Græcorum Patrum. Iustine Martyr indeed excuseth the Jews for raising the words $\delta\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ out of the Text. $\text{Απο το εὐαγγελιον πριμην} \text{αλαμυ} \text{απο δια δαδιδ} \text{μυθισιν} \text{λογων}$ $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{πραχαιας} \text{απειρατων}$ $\delta\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\upsilon\mu\epsilon\ν$ $\text{τοτο} \text{τι} \text{ε} \text{λε} \text{λ} \text{ε} \text{ε} \text{ουαυδ} \text{η} \text{γαρ} \text{τι} \text{α} \text{β} \text{η} \text{ε} \text{λλαται} \text{τοις} \text{ιουδαις}$ $\text{Ο} \text{Κυρι} \text{ε} \text{ε} \text{ισαυισιν} \text{δωτο} \text{τι} \text{ε} \text{λε} \text{λ} \text{ε} \text{α}$ $\text{αφικαν} \text{ειπαται} \text{τοις} \text{ιουδαις}$ $\text{Ο} \text{Κυρι} \text{ε} \text{ε} \text{ισαυισιν}$. But first he doeth not accuse them for raising it out of the Original Hebrew, for $\text{hu} \text{di} \text{coun} \text{se}$ is onely to shew that they abused the LXX. Secondly, though the Jews had raised it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have gotten it out of the Bibles in the Christians hands, in which those words are not to be found.

† The common phrase by which that

* *In fine Martyr shows*

of a man unto the crosse,

τὸ σταυρὸν δι' ὃ παύχην ἑμὲλ-

τῆς σταυρῆς ὀπλᾶται. Εἰς γὰρ

orensis alludeth. In veru

ena Domini, commonly at-

the Crosse: for other roast-

sted hath limbs, as a lamb,

where the roasted body is
simple. Thus, as it is no

ἱερὸν ταυροῦς. As it is re-
 ἱερὸν ταυροῦς ἕλκον διὰ τῆς ἐκείνου

ough indeed it must be con-

and that they ordinarily

the body of a manto hang

id break the bones of those

occasionally. † As Bar-

καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλων αἰμά εὐχῇ.

πονε ὁπ μᾶτὰ τὸ σταυρῶσθαι.

10 ἐξασίλευσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ξύλης.

phetam in Pfalmis, Do-

egem significari putetis ,
h'it ligni. Adz. Marcion.

...inſt Marcion : Eſt enim

ur à ligno, ex quo cru-

make use of those words,

ation, from whence they

translation extant, nor the
in, indeed answered, the same

or indeed excused the Jews

ἔβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου,

them for raising it out of the

secondly, though the Jews

of the Bibles in the Chri-

© 1994

of: those which are still preserved even among the Jews, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

When God foretells by the Prophet Zachary what he should suffer from the sons of men, he says † expressly, *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*; and therefore shews that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of man, and by our nature liable to vulneration; and withall foretells the piercing of his body: which being added to that prediction in the 9. Psalmes, * *they pierced my hands and my feet*, clearly representeth and foretelleth to us the death upon the Crosse, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these Prophecies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that Disciple whom our Saviour loved, and to whom he made a singular application even upon the Crosse; therefore the Jews have used more then ordinary industry and artifice to elude these † two predictions, but in vain. For these two Prophets, David and Zachary, manifestly did foretell the particular punishment of crucifixion.

It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophecies, that the promised **Mefias** was to be *crucified*. And it is as certain that our **Jefus**, the **Chrift** whom we worship, and from whence we receive that honour to be named **Chriftians**, was really and truly *crucified*. It was first the wicked design of **Judas**, who ^a *betrayed* him to that death: it was the malicious cry of the obdurate **Jews**, ^b *crucifie him, crucifie him*. He was actually condemned and *delivered* to that death by **Pilate**, ^c *who gave sentence that it should be as they required*: he was given into the hands of the souldiers, the ^d *instruments* commonly used in infli-

† Zach. 12. 10.
These words of
Zachary are
clear in the O-
riginal והבשר
אלי את ארצו
although the
LXX. have
made an other
sense, ὁ ἀν-
τίχριστος; μ-
ὴν ἀνταρ-
εῖν, by transla-
ting את ארצו
א'ר' א'ר, eo
quod; as also
the Chaldee Pa-
raphrase ע'ר ע'ר
with the Arab-
ic version; so
the Syriack an-
other yet, by
rendering it per
eum quem, as
if they should
look upon one,
and pierce an-
other: yet the
plain construc-
tion of את ארצו

is nothing else but quem, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent מלי, who being the same with him who immediately before prometh to powre upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not מלי but מלי, not on me, but on him, to distinguishing him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of Grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew Copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriack and Arabick translations. Nor can the Rabins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confesse. So R. Solomon Iarchi upon the place, מלי משיח בן דוד. Our Masters have expounded this of the Messias the Son of Joseph. That they interpreted it therefore of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was to be the Son of Joseph, is already denied and refused: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that S. Iohn did apply it to our Savior according to the acknowledged exposition. And in Breshith Rabba we are clearly taught thus much; for unto that question, Who art thou, O great mountain? Zach. 4. 7. he answereth, אנכי ה' משיח בן דוד, the great mountain is the Messias the Son of David. And he proves it from, Grace grace unto us, וחסד וחסד because he giveth grace and supplications, as it is written, Zach. 12. 10. א' Ps. 22. 17. א' בארי ירושלמי. * This Translation indeed seems something different from the Hebrew Text as now we read it. For R. Jacob the son of Chajim cut leo, manus meas & pedes meos. But it was not always read as now it is. For R. Jacob the son of Chajim in Masoreth magna, מסורת אורי האלף, ordine אר, testifieth that he found כפיים בריקים in some correct copies, written in the Text: בארי, but כרי read, and therefore written in the margin בארי. The same is testified by the Masorah on Num. 24. 9. citing the words of this Text, and adding כפיים and Iobannes Isaac Levita confirmeth it by his own experience, who had seen in an ancient Copy בארי in the text, and בארי in the margin. It was anciently therefore without question written בארי, as appeareth not onely by the LXX. who translated it, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, Eoderunt, and Aquila, who rendred it, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, Eoderunt, in the same sense with that of Virgil,

Obscœnas pelagi ferro fœdare volucres.

and the old Syriac, which translateth it כריז transixerunt; but also by the leſſe, or marginal Maſorah, which noteth that the word כריז is found written alike in two places, this and Eſay. 38. 18. but in diuerſe ſignifications. Wherefore being in Eſay it manifeſtly ſignifieth, ſicut leo, it muſt not ſigſſie the ſame in this, and being the Jewes themſelves pretend to nothing elſe, it followeth that it be ſtill read as it was, כריז, and tranſlated toderunt. From whence it alſo appeareth that this was one of the 18. places, which were altered by the Scribes. † For the Maſorah in ſeveral places confeſſeth that 18. places in the Scriptures have been altered by the Scribes, and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but 16. the other two without queſtion are thoſe concerning the crucifixion of the Meſſias, Pſal. 22. 17. and Zach. 12. 10. For that of Zachary, a Jew confeſſed it to Mercurius; and that of David we ſhewed before to be the other. a Mar. 26. 2. b Iohn 19. 15. c Luke 23. 24. † That the ſouldiers did execute the ſentence of death given by the Roman Magiſtrates in their provinces, and not only in the Camp, is evident out of the Hiſtorians of thoſe Nations:

Etting that punishment, who † *led him away to crucifie him*, he underwent † *Mat. 27. 31.*
those previous pains which customarily antecede that suffering, as * flagel-
lation, and bearing of the Crosse; for ^a *Pilate when he had scourged Je-*
sus, delivered him to be crucified: ^b *and he bearing his Crosse went forth*
into Golgotha. They carried him forth out of the city, as by “ custome
in that kind of death they were wont to do, and there between two male-
factors, .i. usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment, they
crucified him. And that he was truly fastned to the Crosse, appears by
the satisfaction given to doubting Thomas, who said, ^c *Except I shall see*
in his hands the print of the nayles, and put my finger into the print of the
nayles, I will not believe: and our Saviour said unto him, *Reach hither*
thy finger, and behold my hands: whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that
he was the Christ, and us, that the Christ was truly crucified: against
that fond † Heresie which made Simon the Cyrenian not onely bear the
Crosse, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore inferre
this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and
unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and tru-
ly crucified, and did really undergoe those sufferings, which were prety-
pified and foretold, upon the Crosse.

Being thus fully assured that the Messias was to be, and that our Christ
was truly crucified; it thirdly concerns us to understand what was the na-
ture of crucifixion, what the Particularities of suffering which he endured
on the Crosse. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was. For
being a Roman punishment, it was continued in that Empire while it re-
mained heathen; but when the Emperours themselves received Christianity,
and the trowing eagles resign'd the flags unto the Crosse, this punishment
was † forbidden by the supreme authority, out of a due respect and pious

* Sciendum
est, Romanis
Pilatum legi-
bus ministras-
se, quibus
sancitum est,
ut qui cruci-
figitur, prius
flagellis ver-
beretur. S.
Hieron. ad
Mat. 27. 27.
To which Lu-
cian alludes in
his own con-
demnation:
‘Εγω μὲν ἀνὴρ
κακοίδητος ὄ-
ναι αὐτῷ, καὶ
διὰ μαρτυρο-
ύμενα γὰρ ἀποτί-
νει. Lucian. in
Piscatore.
Multi occisi,
multi capti,
alii verberati
crucibus affi-
xi. Liv. l. 34.
And l. 28.
Ad palum de-
ligatus, lace-
rato virgis
tergo, cervi-

cem cruci Romanæ subjiciam. So Curtius reports of Alexander; Omnes verberibus affectos sub ipsis
radicibus Petræ crucibus jussit affigi. Thus were the Jews themselves us'd, who caus'd our Saviour to be
scourg'd and crucified: *μαρτυροῦντες ὅτι ὁ δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰνίαν ἀνταρπούμενον.* Ioseph. excid. l. 5.
c. 32. ^a Mat. 27. 26. ^b Iohn 19. 17. ‘*This was observed both by Jews and Romans, that their capital*
punishments were inflicted without their cities. And that particularly was observed in the punishment of cruci-
fixion. Plautus,

Credo ego isthuc extemplo tibi
Esse eundum actutum extra urbem dispeffis manibus,
Patibulum cum habebis.

Tully, Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia.

.i. Thieves and Robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Caesar us'd his Pirates,
τὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειρηγμένων ἀνιστάμενος, Plut. in Vita. Imperator provinciæ jussit Latrones crucibus affigi, Petron. Sat.
Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis. Apuleius de Aur.
Asin. l. 3. Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspendatur. Sen. Epist. 7. Where suspendi
is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latine authors which wrote before the dayes of Constan-
tine. Famofos latrones in his locis ubi grassati sunt furca figendos compluribus placuit. Callist. l. 38.
de pœnis, where furca figendos is put for crucifigendos, being so altered by Tribonianus, who because
Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law. c Ioh. 20. 25, 27. † This
was the peculiar Heresie of Basilides, a man so ancient, that he boasted to follow Glaucias as his Master, who
was the Disciple of S. Peter. And Irenæus hath declared this particularity of his: Quapropter neque pas-
sum eum, & Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo, & hunc secun-
dum ignorantiam & errorem crucifixum transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Iesus, & ipsum
autem Iesum Simonis accepisse formam, & stantem irritasse eos. Adv. Her. l. 1. c. 23. and Tertullian
of the same Basilides: Hunc, (Christum) passum à Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifi-
xum esse: unde nec in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credi-
disse. De Præsc. adv. Her. c. 46. From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius Her. 24. and by S.
Aug. Her. 4. † This is observed by S. Austin, Sermon. 18. de Verbis Dom. Quia ipse honoraturus erat
fideles suos in fine hujus sæculi, prius honoravit crucem in sæculo, ut terrarum principes credentes in
eum probiberent aliquem nocentium crucifigi. And Traët. 36 in Ioh. speaking of this particular punish-
ment; Modo in pœnis reorum non est apud Romanos: ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum
honour

est quod & reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur. Whence appears, first, that in the days of S. Austin Crucifixion was disused: secondly, that it was prohibited by the secular Princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he sheweth not. It is therefore to be observed, that it was first forbidden by the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the Great: Sozomenus gives this relation; Ἀμὲν τοι ἀσπίον νενομισμένον Ρωμαίοις πάλιν τὸ σταυρὸν πάλιν νόμον ἀνέλας τῆς Χριστοῦ τοῦ διωγμένου. l. 1. c. 8.

honour to the death of Christ. From whence it came to passe, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so frequently represent it to the Christians eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or expresse it, it were enough to say that Christ was *crucified*: but being the most usual or * original word doth not of it self declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering, it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the Evangelical relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those Authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

* The Original word in the New Test. for the tree on which our Saviour suffer'd is σταυρός, and the action or crucifixion σταυρωσις; the active σταυρῶν, and the passive σταυρῶμαι.

The form then of the Crosse on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple but a compounded figure, according to the custome of the Romans, by whose Procurator he was condemn'd to dye. In which there was not onely a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a

Ὀδυσ. ε'. Σταυρὸς δ' ἐν τῷ ἱλαρῷ διαμνησὶς ἴδμεν καὶ ἴδμεν,
Πυκνὸς καὶ θαμνίας, τὸ μέλαν δ' ὄρεος ἀμφικύκλωστος.
& Ἰλιάδ. α'. Ἀμὲν ἢ οἱ μυχάλῳ αὐτῷ ἀνέστην ἀνάκτι
σταυροῖσιν πυκνῶσι.

These are the same which Homer elsewhere calls σκόλοπις, and the ancient Grammarians render each by other. As Eustathius, Σταυροί, ἵδμεν καὶ ἀποξυμένῃ ξύλῳ, οἱ δ' αὖτις καὶ σκόλοπις λέγοντο, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζόμεναι, καὶ ἀνασταυρῶμεναι. so he expounding σταυρός, and in the same manner expounding σκόλοπις, λέγοντο ἢ οἱ πύκτοι σκόλοποις καὶ σταυροί, ἐν ᾧ πάλιν τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζέμεν καὶ ἀνασταυρῶμεν. As when Homer describes the Phœcian walls, τεῖχος μακρὸν, Ἰλίου, σκολιπῶν ἀνέστη, he gives this exposition. Σκόλοπις ἢ καὶ πύκτος ξύλον ἵδμεν, οἱ δ' σταυροί. In the same manner Hesychius, Σταυροί, οἱ κατεπαιγνύμενοι σκόλοποις, ῥαχμαί. and, Σκόλοπις, ὁ δὲ ξύλον (l. ὁ δὲ) καὶ ὄξυ ξύλον, σταυροί, ῥαχμαί. and again, Χάραξ, φερεται, ἵδμεν ξύλον ὁ δ' ἢ καὶ αὐτοί, οἱ δ' σταυροί. Besides they all agree in the same Etymology. ὥστε τὸ σταυρῶν, and therefore alwayes take it for a straight standing stake, pale or palisade. Thus Kallistras in Antiphon are briefly rendred ἵδμεν ξύλον, but more expressly thus by Etymologus; Κόλοντις, κυρίως οἱ ἰσοπόδες, κατεπαιγνύμεν ἢ καὶ τὸ κατεπαιγνύμεν ξύλον, ἃ καὶ σταυροί καλεῖται. This is the undoubted signification of σταυρός, in vain denied by Salmasius, who will have it first to signify the same with furca, and then with crux, first the figure of T, and then of T. Whereas all antiquity renders it no other then as a straight and sharp stake. In which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime σταυρωσις or ἀνασκολοπις: being upon a single piece of wood, a defixus & erectus, stipes. And the Greeks which wrote the Roman history, used the word σταυρός as well for their palus, as their crux. As when Antony beheaded Antiochus the King of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution, Ἀντίχον ἡμισέκοτον σταυρῷ προσέθηκεν. not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the Roman custome, as those died in Livy, l. 28. Deligati ad palum, virgisque caesi, & secuti percussii: so that σταυρῷ προσέθηκεν, ad palum deligare. Thus were the heads of men said ἀνασταυρῶμεναι, as of Niger and Albinus in Dio and Herodian; which cannot be meant but of a single palus: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inarus to death, ἀνασταυρῶντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τρεῶν σταυροῖς, not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierced his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharped at the upper end; as appears by the like Persian punishment inflicted by Parysatis on Mesabates, delivered by Plutarch in Artaxerxe, προσέθηκεν ἐν δὲ αἵματι ξύλον, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγιον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀνέστη, τὸ δ' εἶμα γυμνὸς διαπυκνῶσθαι, which the Latine Translator renders in tres fustolli cruces; (a thing impossible) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the Excerpta of Ctesias is delivered onely in the word ἀνασταυρῶν. σταυρός therefore is no more originally then σκόλος, a single stake, or an erect piece of wood, upon which many suffered who were said ἀνασταυρῶμεναι and ἀνασκολοπιζόμεναι, and when other transverse or prominent parts were added in a perfect crosse, it retained still the original name, not onely of σταυρός but also of σκόλος, as ἀπειλὰς εἰς ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ δόκῳ ὥστε τὸ σκόλον ὅτι ὡς εἰς ἀεὶ ἀεὶς ἡδύτης, &c. πάλιν ἐπὶ τῷ σκόλῳ αὐτὸν φανὴν ὅτι ἀπένει. Celsus apud Orig. l. 2. Thus in that long, or rather too long, verse written by Andax to S. Augustine. Epist. 139. Expectat quos plena fides Christi de stipite pendens.

† trans-

Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antenna scilicet sua, & illo sedilis excessu. *Where the excessus is the* *in iuxta, signifying the nature, as the sedile signifieth the use of the part. Which in another place, in imitation* *of Iustinus, he refers unto the Typical Unicorn. Nam & in antenna navis, quæ crucis pars est, extremitates cornua vocantur: Unicornis autem medio stipite palus. Adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 18. & Adv. Iud. c. 10.* *To this sedile in the cross Marcenas seemeth to allude in those words in Seneca, Hanc mihi vel acuta subfidem cruce sustine. And Seneca himself does expound him; Suffragas licet & acutam sessuro crucem subdas, est tanti vulnus suum premere, & patibulo pendere districtum. Epist. 101. Of this Innocentius the first also speaks Serm. 1. de uno Martyr. Fuerunt in Cruce Dominica ligna quatuor; stipites erectus, & lignum transversum, truncus suppositus, & titulus superpositus. This Gregorius Turonensis, after the use of the Cross was long omitted, interpreted of suppedaneum, a piece of wood fastned under the feet of him that suffered. De glo. Marty. c. 6. Clavorum ergo Dominicorum gratia quod quatuor fuerint hæc est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis & duo in plantis; & quæritur cur plantæ affixæ sint; quæ in cruce sancta dependere visæ sunt potius quam stare. Sed in stipite erecto foramen factum manifestum est. Pes quoque parvulæ tabellæ in hoc foramen insertus est. Super hanc vero tabulâ tantum stantis hominis faciem affixæ sunt plantæ.*

* That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by S. Luke ἐπιγεγραφή, by S. Matthew αἰνία, by S. Mark ἡ ἐπιγεγραφή τῆς αἰνίας, and by S. Iohn τίτλος. making use of a Latine word, as is observed by Nonnus.

Καὶ Πανάγιος Διόνυσος ἐπιγεγραφεὶς μάρτυρι ῥωμαίων ἱεροῦμα, τὸ πρὸς καλῶς Λατίνῳ δὲ τίτλῳ ἰσχύ. From all which we may collect, that there was an Inscription written over the head of our Saviour, signifying the accusation and pretended crime for which he was condemned to that death. Glossæ Vet. αἰνία, causa, materia, titulus.

As, Ovid. Trist. 3. Eleg. 1. Causa superpositæ scripto testata coronæ.

Servatos cives indicat huius ope.

that is, O B C I V E S S E R V A T O S was ἐπιγεγραφή τῆς αἰνίας, causa scripto testata. In the language of Suetonius, Titulus, qui causam pœne indicavit.

As, Ovid Fastorum 6.

Vixit ut occideret damnatus crimine regni:

Huic illi titulum longa senectæ dabat.

This was done according to the Roman custome, as we read in Dio l. 54. of the son of Capio, τὸν δὲ λαντὸν τὸν ἀποδίστα αὐτὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς μόνος μετὰ γραμμάτων, τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς καταπίσεως αὐτοῦ δακνῶντων, διαγραφὴν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστυφύσας. This title was written upon a table, and that table fastned to the upper part of the Crosse. The Syriack, Arabick, and Persian Translations render τίτλος expressly a Table. And Hefschius, Titulus, πλυσθὸν ἐπιγεγραμμά ἐστιν, (not ἔστιν, as it is printed) not the Inscription it self, but that upon which the Inscription was written. Thus the Epistle of the French unto the Christians in Asia represents the Inscription of the Martyr Attalus in a Table: ἀπολαβὴς καὶ τὸ ἀμφοτέρωθεν, πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπογράφοντες, ἐν ᾧ ἐπιγράψαντο Ῥωμαῖοι, ὅτις ἐστὶν Ἀττάλος ὁ Χριστιανός. Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. And Sozomen describing the invention of the Crosse by Helena, says there were three several crosses in the same place; καὶ ἡρώδης ἀλλοῦλον ἐν μίσει λαμβάνειν ἵκανα καὶ ἐπιγεγραμμάτων ἑρμηνεύς, ἑλληνιστὴς τε καὶ Ῥωμαῖος. This Nicephorus calls λευκὸν σάβαν, which is the proper interpretation of λευκὸν μα. Saida, λευκὸν μα, τίτλος (Etymol. πῶς) γὰρ ἀλλοιματὶς ὡς γὰρ ἀποδίστα πρᾶγμα τῶν ἐπιγεγραμμένων. Hefsch. Saida, δὲ λευκὸν μα (as Julius Pollux joyes σαις and λευκὸν μα together.) ἐν ᾧ αἱ γραφαὶ Ἀδύνητον ἐπεγράφοντες τὰς κακουργίας. τίτλος ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, leg. στυγὴ. His meaning is, that such a λευκὸν μα as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the cross on which they suffered: and without question he speaks this in reference to our Saviours Crosse, because he used in a manner the same words with S. Iohn: τίτλος ἐπὶ τῷ στυγί, says Hefsch. ἰδὺν ἐπὶ τῷ στυγί, saith S. Iohn. It was therefore a Table of wood whited and fastned to the top of the Crosse, on which the Accusation or Crime was written, as it is expressed by Nicephorus. Σαῖς λευκὸν ἢ βαπτιστὴν ἡ λευκὸν γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Πανάγιος ὡς καὶ καλῶς ἰσχύει, ἐν εἰς σῆμα βαπτιστῆς ὡς λευκὸν τὸν στυγιστὴν ἀποδίστα. Hist. Eccl. l. 8. 29. And thus there were, as Xanthopoulos observes, Ὁ στυγίς, δῆλον, καὶ γραφὴς τίτλος ὄντων. a Luc. 23. 2. b Iohn 19. 12. † Auctores seditionis aut tumultus, pro qualitatibus dignitate, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut bestis obijciuntur. Paulus l. 5. tit. 22.

† As Orates
the Persian,
when he had
treacherously
and cruelly
murdered Po-
lycrates the
Tyrant of Sa-
mos; *ἡ δὲ αὐτοῦ
ἀποκρίσις ἡ
ἐκείνου. He-
rod. l. 3.* So
Antiochus first
cut off the head
of Achaus, and
then fastned
his body to a
Cross. *Ἐδὲ
ἀποκρίναι τὸν
ἀρχηγὸν αὐτοῦ
τοῦ ἀχαιοῦ, καὶ
τὸν κομᾶν αὐ-
τοῦ ἐν σταυρῷ
κατακτείναντα
αὐτὸν ἐν σταυ-
ρῷ. *ἡ δὲ αὐτοῦ
ἀποκρίσις ἡ
ἐκείνου. He-
rod. l. 3.* This was
the design of
Tarquinius
Priscus, when
the extremity
of labour which
he laid upon
his subjects
made many lay
violent hands
upon them-
selves; Passim
conscita nece
Quiritibus
tædium su-
gientibus, no-
vum & inex-
cogitatum
autea postea-
que, remedi-
um invenit ille Rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum figeret crucibus corpora, spectanda civibus simul,*

beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that they have in their † breathlesse corps by vertue of this punishment suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the Crosse hath been thought a ∴ sufficient ignominy to those which dyed, and terrour to those which liv'd to see it. Yea where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts, to take their representations preserved in their † pictures, and affix them to the Crosse. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour's sufferings, the bitterness of pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

It is necessary we should thus profess faith in Christ crucified, as that punishment which he chose to undergoe, as that way which he was pleased to die. First, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the malediction of the Law. For we were all under the curse; because it is expressly written, *a Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to doe them*: and it is certain none of us hath so continued; for the *b Scripture hath concluded all under sin*, which is nothing else but a breach of the Law: therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now *c Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*; that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid onely upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the Law. For it was written, *d Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*. Not that Suspension was any of the Capital punishments prescribed by the law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custome of the Jews they were wont to punish malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death according to the law or custome of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact oft-times after death expos'd to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those who † being dead were so hanged on a tree, were accursed by the law. Now though Christ was not to dye by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged, which is *the hanging on a tree*. For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth

um invenit ille Rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum figeret crucibus corpora, spectanda civibus simul, & feris volucribusque laceranda: *Plin. l. 36. 15.* Who makes this handsome observation of it; Quam obrem pudor Romani nominis proprius, qui sæpe res perditas servavit in præliis, tunc quoque subvenit; sed illo tempore imposuit, tum erubescens cum puderet vivos, tanquam puditorum esset extinctos. * Thus they used Celsus, one of the 30. Tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio testifieth: Novo injuriæ genere imago in crucem sublata, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videretur affixus. *a Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10. b Gal. 3. 22. c Gal. 3. 13. d Deut. 21. 13. † Deut. 21. 22.* If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree. In which words, being put to death precedeth being hanged. But I confesse, in our English translation it hath another sense, [and he be to be put to death,] as if he were to dye by hanging. And so the Vulgar Latine, Et adjudicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo; as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were suspension. And the Syriac yet more expressly, & appendatur ligno atque interficiatur. But there is no such sentence contained in the Original, as the Vulgar, nor summition of death, as our English Translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is *וּמָצָא* in Hophal, that is, intersectus, occisus, mori factus fuerit or, as the LXX. clearly translate it, *καὶ ἀποκτενέσθαι* and the Chaldee *וּמָצָא* & occisus fuerit.

D E A D

THough Crucifixion of it self involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastned to a Crosse is to leisurely to dye, as that he being taken from the same may live; though when the insulting Jews in a malicious derision call'd to our Saviour to *save himself*, and *come down from the Crosse*, he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us; yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfill'd the utmost intention of Crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him *crucified*, we believe him *dead*.

For the Illustration of which part of the Article, it will be necessary ; First, to shew that the Messias was to dye, that no sufferings, howsoever shameful or painful ; were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death : Secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not onely suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life ; but upon and by the same, did finish this life by a true and proper death : Thirdly to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more then this cannot be necessary to shew we believe that *Christ was dead.*

First then, we must consider what S. Paul *delivered to the Corinthians first of all*, and what *also he received*, ^a *how that Christ dyed for our sinnes according to the Scriptures*; that the Messiah was the *Lamb slain before the foundations of the world*, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an expresse and lively Type of the promised Messiah; though after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife: though Abraham be said to have ^b *offered up his onely-begotten Son*, when Isaac dyed not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastned to the Crosse, and offer'd up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being ^c *without effusion of blood there is no remission*, without death no sacrifice for sin, being the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the Anti-type, but rather suppose and assert it, as prefiguring his resurrection from the dead, ^d *from whence Abraham received him in a figure*; we may safely affirm the ancient and legal Types did represent a Christ which was to dye. It was an essential part of the Paschal Law, that the Lamb should be slain: and in the sacrifices for sin, which prefigined a Saviour to ^e *sanctifie the people with his own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary.*

Nor did the Types onely require, but the Prophecies also foretel his death. For *he was brought*, saith Isaiah, *† as a Lamb to the slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living*, saith the same Prophet, *and made his soul an offering for sin*. Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the † Jews shew not the least appearance of probability in their evasions.

serve God while he liveth. As Psal. 27. 12. I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodnesse of the Lord in the land of the living: and Isa. 38. 11. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living; which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow. I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. The land of the living then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they perswade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be cutt off out of the land of the living is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, to dye.

a 1 Cor. 15. 3.
b Heb. 11. 17.
c Heb. 9. 22.
d Heb. 11. 19.
e Heb. 13. 11.
f Is. 53. 7, 8, 10
† That this
place of Isaiah
must be under-
stood of the

Mefstias, I have already proved against the Jews, out of the Text, and their own Traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the land of the living is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Iarehi, **הא ארץ ישראל** from the land of the living, that is, the land of Israel. And D. Kimchi endeavours to prove that exposition out of David, **יְנִידוּ, אֶרֶץ חַיִּים כְּאֶדֶם** נָלַךְ מִמֶּנּוּ שִׁקְוָה אֶרֶץ שְׂמֹרָת אֶתְּחִיל לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם **הָאֵדֶם** as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in the land of the living; whereas there is no more in that phrase, than that he will

Being then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messias was to dye, and that a violent death; being we have already prov'd, there is but one Messias foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places which they will not acknowledge, that he was to be slain; it followeth, by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised Messias was ordain'd to dye: which is our first assertion.

1 Cor. 5. 7.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these Types and prophecies, that *Christ our Passeeover is slain*, that he whom we believe to be the true and onely Messias did really and truly dye. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denyall. Jesus of Nazareth upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtain'd, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believ'd it, even they were satisfied with it: the chief-Priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees, the publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadduces most of all, who hugg'd their old opinion, and lov'd their error the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denyed, or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the Sun put on mourning, why were the graves open'd, but for a funeral? Why did the earth quake, why were the rocks rent, why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature dyed? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such Tragick spectacles, why did they beat upon their breasts and return, but that they were assured *it was finished*, there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the mercilesse souldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to dispatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an incontinent villany pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man, thereby becoming stronger witnesses then they would, by being lesse the authors then they desir'd, of his death. For out of his sacred, but wounded side, came blood and water, both as evident signes of his present death, as certain seals of our future and eternal life. These are the the two blessed Sacraments of the Spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The Sacrament of Baptism, the water through which we passe into the Church of Christ, teacheth us that he dyed to whom we come. *For know you not*, saith S. Paul, *that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?* The Sacrament of the Lords supper, the bread broken, and the wine pour'd forth, signifie that he dyed which instituted it; and *as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lords death till he come.*

Rom. 6. 3.

1 Cor. 11. 26.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the Crosse; and that not by a feign'd or metaphorical, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which the sons of Adam have, so did he undergoe a true and proper death, in the same manner as we dye. † Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life it self consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the soul; and the intimate prefence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which soul from the body

† Το ἔμψυχον τὸ
ἀψύχον διὸν
μελέσται διαρί-
σθαι δοκῶν, καὶ ὅτι
τὸ καὶ τὸ αἰσθη-
τικόν, παρελ-
φάμεν ὅτι καὶ
παρὰ τὸν ἀπο-
βουλεύσαντος καὶ
διὸ ταῦτα καὶ
ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή. Arist. de anima, l. 1. c. 2. ἢ διαρίσθαι τὸ ἀψύχον (leg. ἔμψυχον) τὸν ἀψύχον, καὶ
ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή διαρίσθαι ὅτι καὶ αἰσθητικόν, φανταστικόν, νοητικόν. Sallust. de Diis & Mundo, c. 8.

in

in man our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition, *a* *Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.* Now being death is nothing else but the privation or *recession* of life, and we are then properly said to dye when we cease to live; being life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection; death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul before united to the body. As therefore when the soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vitall activity, we say that body or that man is dead: so when we read that Christ our Saviour dyed, we must conceive that was a true and proper death, and consequently that his body was bereft of his soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

Nor is this only our conception, or a doubtful truth; but we are as much assured of the propriety of his death, as of the death it self. For that the unspotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of natural life by the succession of that soul, appeareth by his own resignation, *b* *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;* and by the Evangelist's expression, *and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.* When he was to dy, he resigned his soul; when he gave it up, he dyed; * when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body

a Mat. 10. 28

* As Secundus,

φύλη καὶ ψυ-

χὴς βίη.

† As the Phi-

losophers have

anciently ex-

pressed it, espe-

cially Plato,

who by the ad-

vantage of an

error in the

Original of

souls, best un-

derstood the

end of life.

Τὸ πρῶτον δὲ

ἀποφασίζοντες,

ὅτι ἡ ψυχή ἐστι

ἀθάνατος, καὶ

ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν

ἐκ τοῦ σώματος

ἐκτείνει.

in Phadone.

again, Ὁ δὲ

θεὸς αὐτὴν ἐκ

τοῦ σώματος

ἐκτείνει, καὶ

ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν

ἐκτείνει, καὶ

ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν

ἐκτείνει.

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή ἀθάνατος, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἐκτείνει. in Phadone. Thus with 4. several words, λόγος, διαλύσις, χωρισμός, and ἀπαλαγή, doth Plato expresse the separation of the soul from the body, and maketh death formally to consist of that separation: This solution is excellently expressed by Phocylides.

Οὐ κελὸν ἀρνηθῆναι ἀναλίσθαι ἀνθρώπου.

Ψυχὴ γὰρ μὴ μνησθῆναι ἀέρος ἐν φθιτοῖσι.

Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἐστὶ θεὸς χωρὶς θνητῶν καὶ εἰναι

Σῶμα γὰρ ἐκ γὰτος ἰχθυῶν, καὶ πάντες ἐκ αὐτῶν

ἀνθρώποι καὶ κύνες ἰσχυρῶς ἀπὸ δ' ἀπὸ πνέματος ἀίδιον.

So Tertullian. Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis animæque. De Anima. cap. 51. Si mors non aliud determinatur, quam disjunctio corporis animæque; contrarium morti vita non aliud definitur quam conjunctio corporis animæque. *ibid.* c. 27. This description of death is far more philosophical than the notion of Aristotle, who makes it to consist in the corruption of natural heat. (Ανάγκη τοίνυν εἶναι τὸν ζῆν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν θερμὴν φύσιν συνελθαι, ὥστε καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου εἶναι τὴν τῆς φθορᾶς. in Part. Natural) in as much as the soul is not that natural heat, and the corruption of that heat followeth upon the separation of the soul. b Luke 23. 26. † This is expressed three wayes, all signifying the separation of his soul from his body. S. Mark and S. Luke ἐξέπνευσεν, which is of the same force with ἐξέψυξε. But because ἐκψέχειν doth not alwayes signifie an absolute expiration, but sometimes a lipothymy only; as Hesychius, ἐκψέχειν, λιποθυμία: so Hippocrates useth it, Εἰσι δὲ ἐξέπναισι (κατὰ) θόρυβον ἢ ἐκψέχειν δὲ τὴν ἀφαισίαν, l. 1. de Morbis; and again, ἐκψέχειν ἢ δὲ τὴν αἵματι τὴν μακροσύναν ἐξαιρῶνται, lest therefore we should take ἐξέπνευσεν in such an imperfect sense, S. Matth. bathit ἀόρα τὸ πνέμα, and S. Iohn, περιπαῖον τὸ πνέμα, which is a full expression of the secession of the soul from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus, πνεῦμα ὁ θάνατος. * These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient Philosophical subtilty, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The Question was propounded thus, Quæsitum est, quando moriens moreretur, cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret. Where Taurus admonisheth the rest, that this was no light question; for, sayes he, gravissimi Philosophorum super hac re serio quæsierunt; et alii moriendi verbum atque momentum in ætate adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt, alii nihil in illo tempore vitæ reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vendicarunt. The ancienter Philosophers were divided, some saying a man dyed in the time of his life, others in the time of his death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to dye while he is alive, nor when he is dead: & idcirco peperit ipse aliud quoddam novum in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὸ ἐξαιρῶν φάσι appellavit: which he thus describes in his Parmenides, Τὸ γὰρ ἐξαιρῶν τοῦτον τὸ ἐκ τῆς σφαίρας. αὐτὸς ἐξ ἐκείνης μεταβάλλει εἰς ἄλλαν. So A. Gellius. l. 6. c. 13. Thus when our Saviour Commended his soul into the hands of the Father, he was yet alive; when the souldier pierced his side, he was already dead; and the instant in which he gave up the Ghost, was the τὸ ἐξαιρῶν when he dyed.

dead : and so the eternal Son of God upon the Crosse did properly and truly dye.

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet further illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an external violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the soul : the torments which he endured on the Crosse did bring him to that state, in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow.

For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin onely excepted, had in his nature not onely a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying ; and as to any extrinsecal violence, able according to the common course of nature to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no natural preservative ; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue it's vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily dy, as he said of himself, *No man*
John 10. 18. *takeh away my life from me, but I lay it down of my self : I have*
power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. For it was in his power whether he would come into the power of his enemies ; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the Crosse ; it was in his power to have come down from the Crosse, when he was nailed to it : but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

Mark 15. 44. 'Tis true that *Pilate marvelled* he was dead so soon, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to dye by the accession of another pain ; but we read not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they such kind of agony as he was in, the night before. What though *he cryed with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost* ? what though the *Centurion when he saw it, said, Truly this man was the Son of God* ? the miracle was not in the death, but in the voice : the strangeness was not that he should dye, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud : he dyed not by, but with a miracle.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to substract his soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration ; we might rationally say, the Jews and Gentiles were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him : guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments on which in time death must necessarily follow ; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted : whereas S. Peter expressly chargeth his enemies, *ⁱ Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*; and again, *ⁱ The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree.* Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the Jews authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion.

ⁱ Acts 2. 23.
ⁱ Acts 5. 30.
In both which
places the Ori-
ginal sheweth
more expressly
that by their
crucifixion they
slew him: in the
former thus,
διὰ χειρὸς ἀνό-
μων ὁμοσεύων
τοῦ δεινιστοῦ. in
the latter thus,
ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ ἐ-
πιστάμενοι καὶ
οὐκ ἐλάλ-

Wherefore being Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the plowers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastned him to the Crosse; being these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghost*; it followeth, that the onely-

onely-begotten son of God, the true Messias promised of old, did dye a true and proper death. Which is the second Conclusion in this Explication.

But thirdly, because Christ was not onely man, but also God, and there was not onely an union between his soul and body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and an union in his person: it will be further necessary, for the understanding of his death, to shew what union was dissolved, what continued; that we may not make that separation either lesse or greater then it was.

Whereas then there were two different substantial unions in Christ, one of the parts of his humane nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures humane and divine, by which it came to passe that God was man, and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already shewed, that the union of the parts of his humane nature was dissolved on the Crosse, and a real separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of humane nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second person of the Trinity.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first from the language of this very † Creed. For as we proved before, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceiv'd*, and *born*, and *suffer'd*, and that the truth of these propositions relyed upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union: so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same person, that he *was buried*, and *descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church, that God dyed for us; which cannot be true, except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever substract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinfull demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

'Tis true, Christ cryed upon the crosse with a loud voice saying, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But if that dereliction should signifie a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life. Whereas indeed those words infer no more, then that he was bereft of such joyes and comforts from the Deity, as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

It remaineth therefore that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered onely an external violence; and what was subject to such cor-

negas, & tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, & ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro, & tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro. S. August. in Joh. Tract. 48.
* Greg. Nyss. Orat. 1. de Resur. "Ολον τὸν ἀνθρώπον αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς μοῦς ἰαυτὸν ἀναχέστας εἰς τὴν θείαν φύσιν μετασκευάσας, ὡς τὸ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ὀκνοῦντος ἢ διατίθεσθαι τὸ ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀνθρώπου ἀνακαταστάσει, καὶ οὐ τὸ χαλεπῶς ἀλλὰ τὴν μὴ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν σώματος ἀλλὰ τὸν ὅλον ἀνθρώπον μετακαταστήσει, ἵδμεν."

† Credimus certe non in solum Deum Patrem, sed & in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Modo totum dixi, in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; totum ibi intellige & verbum & animam & carnem. Sed utique consuetis etiam illud quod habet eadem Fides, in eū Christū te credere qui crucifixus est & sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultū Christum esse non

poral force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecillity and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body fail'd the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporal or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word, therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either soul or body; but † after it was made flesh, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

Thus Christ did really and truly dye, according to the condition of death, to which the nature of man is subject: but although he was more then man, yet he dyed no more then man can dye: a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoyned one from other, but not from him that took them both together, * rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential part of the Mediatorship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every Office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the Prophetic office, that Christ should dye, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by his death: he was the ^a true and faithful witness, ^b who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession. ^c This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bare witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood. He preached unto us a new ^d and better covenant, which was established upon better promises, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the ^e blood of the new Testament, or ^f everlasting Covenant: for that covenant was also a testament; and ^g where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. Beside Christ, as a Prophet, taught us not onely by word, but by example; and though every action of his life, who came to fulfill the law, be most worthy of our imitation, yet the most eminent example was in his death; in which he taught us much varietie of Christian virtues. What example was that of faith in God, ^h to lay down his life that he might take it again, in the bitterness of his torments to ⁱ commend his spirit into the hands of his Father, and ^k for the joy was set before him, to endure the crosse, and despise the shame? What a pattern of meeknesse, patience, and humility, for the ^l Son of man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many? ^m to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth? to ⁿ endure the contradictions of sinners against himself, and to ^o humble himself unto death, even the death of the

† This is the conclusion of S. August. Ex quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, & susceptus est à Verbo homo, id est totus homo, anima & caro, quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? animam vero à Verbo non separavit. Si enim mortuus est Dominus... sine dubio caro ipsius expiravit animam (ad tempus enim exiguum anima deferuit carnem, sed redeunte anima resurrecturam) à Verbo autem animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, Hodie mecum eris in paradiso: fidelium latronis animam non deferbat, & deferbat suam? absit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima posuit, & iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdissimus sensus est: non enim quæ à Verbo non erat separata, à seipsa potuit separari. Tract. in Ioh. 47. * Έκει δὲ μαρτυρῶν ὅτι τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σῶμα, ἀλλὰ ἡ καὶ μονοθεΐς ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις, ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν σώματι. ὅτι τῆς φύσεως διαζύγιον ἡ συνδιαζύγιος τοῦ συνθέτου τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἑμπαλιν ἵκνται ἡ γὰρ ἕνότης τῆς θείας φύσεως, τῆς καὶ τὸ ἴσον ἐν ἀμοτίτοις ὄντι, πάλιν πρὸς ἄλλα τὰ δυνάμει συμφύει. Greg. Nyss. Orat. 1. de Resurr. Tam velox incorruptæ carnis vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis, quoniam Deitas quæ ab utraque suscepti hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit. Leo Serm. 1. de Resurr. a Rev. 3. 14. b 1 Tim. 6. 13. c 1 Ioh. 5. 6, 8. d Heb. 8. 6. e Matth. 26. 28. Luke 22. 20. Heb. 10. 29. f Heb. 13. 20. g Heb. 9. 16. h Ioh. 10. 17. i Luke 23. 46. k Heb. 12. 2. l Matth. 20. 28. m Act. 8. 32. n Heb. 12. 3. o Phil. 2. 8.

crosse?

croffe? What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God to learn obedience by the things that he suffered, to be made under the Law, and, though he never broke the law, to become obedient unto death, to goe with chearfulnesse to the croffe upon this resolution, as my Father gave me commandement, even so I doe? What exemplar of Charity, to dye for us while we were yet sinners and enemies, when greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends; to pray upon the croffe for them that crucified him, and to apologize for such as barbarously slew him, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they doe? Thus Christ did suffer for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps; that as he suffered for us in the flesh, we should arme our selves likewise with the same minde. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin: that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. And so his death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his Prophetical Office.

Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should dye, and by his death perform the Sacerdotal Office. For every high-Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sinnes. But Christ had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins then himself. For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sinnes: and therefore when Sacrifice and offering God would not, then said he, Loe, I come to do thy will, O God; then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood there is no remission; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin, he must of necessity dye, and so make his soul an offering for sin. If Christ be our Paschever, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us, must give his life for our redemption: for we could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but onely with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. We all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an act of that justice the sentence of death pass'd upon us; it was necessary therefore that Christ our surety should dy, to satisfie the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sins; and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must dye who was to reconcile him to us. For when we were enemies, saith S. Paul, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We were sometimes alienated and enemies in our minde by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his Priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation and satisfaction for the sinnes of the whole world: and not onely for the act it self, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it: (For if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our consciences from dead works?) and of the happinesse flowing from it; For he that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Upon this assurance founded on his death, we have the freedome and boldnesse to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh. Neither was the death of Christ necessary onely in respect of us immediately for whom he dyed, but in reference to the Priest himself who dyed, both in

Heb. 5. 8.

Phil. 2. 8.

Ioh. 14. 31.

Rom. 5. 8.

Iohn 15. 13.

1 Pet. 2. 21.

4. 1. 2.

Heb. 5. 1.

Heb. 10. 4.

9.

Heb. 9. 22.

Isa. 53. 10.

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 21.

Heb. 9. 13, 14.

Rom. 8. 32.

Heb. 2. 19, 20.

in regard of the qualification of himself, and consummation of his Office.
Heb. 10. 17, 18. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest, and having suffered, being tempted might be able to succour them that are tempted: so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the paines of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became as an experimental Priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of our temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his Offering. For as the High-Priest once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the Holy of Holies *not without blood*; so Christ being come an High-Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, by his own blood entered in once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect of his Sacerdotal Office.

Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should dye in reference to his Regall Office. *O King, live for ever*, is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal Princes; either the expression of our desires, or the suggestion of their own: whereas our Christ never shew'd more Sovereign power then in his death, never obtained more then by his death. It was not for nothing, that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintain'd what he had written, *This is the King of the Jews*. That title on the Crosse did signifie no lesse then that his Regal power was active even there: for *having spoyled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it; and through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil*. Nor was his death onely necessary for the present execution, but also for the affecution of further power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The Spirit of Christ in the Prophets of old testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that would follow. *He shall drink of the brook in the way*, saith the Prophet David; *therefore shall he lift up his head*. *He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name. For to this end Christ both dyed and rose and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living.*
Heb. 2. 15.
Col. 2. 14.
1 Pet. 1. 11.
Psal. 11. 70.
Pbil. 2. 8, 9.
Rom. 14. 9.

Thus it is necessary to believe and professe our faith in Christ who dyed: for by his blood and the vertue of his death was our Redemption wrought, as the price which was pay'd, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the Covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which Exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceived to expresse thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which was dead. I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental truth, that the onely-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly dye, so as by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ which was crucified and dead.

AND

AND BURIED.

When the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was layd up in the chambers of the grave: so that as we believe him *dead*, by the separation of his soul, we also believe him *buried*, by the sepulture of his body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the Article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shewn, first, that the promised Messias was to be buried, and secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messias was to be.

That the Messias was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to dye among the Jews; because it was the universal custome of that nation to † bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their Fathers graves, yet publick sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lye in: and not onely they, but all the Instruments which were used in the punishment, were buried with them. And yet beside the general consequence of death among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for as that Prophet *was three dayes and three nightes in the whales belly*, so was the Messias, or *the Son of man*, to be *three dayes and three nightes in the heart of the earth*.

Nor was his Burial onely represented Typically, but foretold Prophetically, both by a suppositive intimation, and by an expresse prediction. The Psalmist intimated and supposed no lesse, when speaking in the person of the Christ he said, *My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy one to see corruption*. That flesh is there supposed onely such, that is, a body* dead, and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead, yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrifie. Beside this intimation there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the Messias, in that eminent prediction of Isaiah, *He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death*. For whatsoever the true interpretation of the Prophecie be,

† It is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman custome, *Corpora condere, quam cremare, è more Aegyptio*. Hist. l. 5. As of the Egyptians by others, *ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*. Laert. Pyrrh. But the Jews received this custome no more from the Egyptians then from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow because they used not the Egyptian *μεγίστους νεκρῶν*.

more distinguished from the Romans then from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. *ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*. Lucian. *ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*. Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews received their custome of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham at the first purchased a burying place; yet it hath been observed, and is certainly true, that their general custome was to interre. Philo, one of their own writers: *Ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ζώων ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*. in Flaccum. a Matth. 12. 40. b Psal. 16. 9. * So the Midrash Tillim anciently expounded it, My flesh shall rest in hope. *אין מיתה ואין חולדה, אין מיתה ואין חולדה*, adding, that the moth and worm should have no power over him. Whence by the Argument of S. Peter, it must be understood not of David, for his flesh saw corruption, nor of any other but the Messias. And although the Rabbins are wont to say that the worm shall never eat the just, in opposition to the last words of Esay; yet they must confesse there is no difference in the grave; and therefore that worm must signifie something else then the corruption of the body. Well therefore are those words paraphrased by Didymus, *ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῇ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνους ἐκείνους, ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνους ἐκείνους*. c Isa. 55. 9.

H h

(of

(of which we shall speak hereafter) it is certain that he which was to be cut off was to have a grave: and being we have already shewn, that he which was to be cut off was the Messias; it followeth, that by vertue of this prediction the promised Messias was to be buried.

Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, was thus buried; we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenc'd by the Romans to dye upon the Crosse, had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were † exposed to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field, or, if they escaped their voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather. A guard was also usually † set about them, lest any pitting hand should take the body from the curf'd tree, and cover it with earth.

† To this cu-
stome Horace
alludes, Epist.
16. l. 1. Non
hominem oc-
cidi: non pas-
ces in cruce
corves. and
Juvenal, Vul-
turi jumento
& canibus

Under that custome of the Roman Law was now the body of our crucibusque relictiis, Ad factus properat, partemque cadaveris affert. So Prudentius, Crux illum tol-
lat in auras, Viventem oculos offerat alitibus, &c. seq. Hymn. 4. This punishment did appear in the
Mythology of Prometheus: who though he were by some represented simply, as δεινός, by others particu-
larly he is describ'd as ἀνταυρούμενος, especially by Lucian, who delivers him ἀνταυρούμενος, κερύκεσσι, &c.
ἀνταυρούμενος, ἀνταυρούμενος, ἀνταυρούμενος. And Tertullian speaking of Pontus from whence Marcion
came; Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illic nisi feritas calet, quæ fabulas scenis dedit, de sacrificiis
Taurorum, & amoribus Colchorum, & crucibus Caucaforum. Adv. Marcio. l. 1. c. 1. He touches the
subject of three Tragedies. Medea, Iphigenia in Tauris, and Prometheus vincit, or rather crucifixus. As there-
fore the Eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous ra-
pacity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of them what Augustus once said, Cuidam sepulcrum petenti
respondit, jam illam in volucrum esse potestate. Suet. c. 13. Nor were they onely in the power of the
fowls of the air, as Prometheus was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him, &c. γὰρ τα-
πεινὴν καὶ ἀσθενήσαντα δεῖν κρεῖν, says Vulcan in Lucian for that reason; but ordinarily they hung so low
upon the Crosse, that the ravenous beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes Patibuli cruciatum, cum
canes & vultures intima protrahunt viscera. * So the bodies were often left upon the Crosse till the
sun and rain had putrified and consumed them. As when the daughter of Polycrates did see her fathers fate
in a dream to be wash'd by Jupiter, and to be anointed by the Sun, when he hung upon the Crosse, it was per-
formed, Πολυκράτης ἡ ἀνταυρούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ αἰνῇ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τοῦ ἰουπέρος· ἵνα τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ὕδατος ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐ-
ρανοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνέτης αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἐκχυθείη. Herod. Thalia. Of which Tertul. de anima, c. 46.
Ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit de Solis unguine & lavacro Jovis. And which is fur-
ther thus expressed by Valerius Maximus: Putres ejus artus, & tabido cruore inanantia membra, atq;
illam lavam cui Neptunus annulum piscatoris restituerat, litu marcidam, Sames lætis oculis
aspexit, l. 6. c. 9. Thus were the bodies of the crucified left, ut in sublimi putrescerent: Quid Cyrenæum
Theodorum Philosopherum non ignobilem nonne miramur? cui cum Lylimachus Rex crucem mi-
naretur, Iltis quæso, inquit, ista horribilia minitare purpuratis tuis; Theodori quidem nihil interest
humine an sublimi putrescat. Cicero l. 1. Tusc. Quest. and so they perished, as the Scythians generally did,
according to the description of Silius Italicus, l. 13.

At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera truncis

Leata dies sepelit, putri liquentia tabo.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of those which were
crucified was consumed; as Artemidorus observed, who concluded from thence, that it was bad for the rich to
dream of being crucified, Τὸς ἡ πλουσίους βλάπτει· γυνὴ γὰρ σταυρῶν, καὶ τὰς σάρκας διαλύσας αὐτὴν σταυρῶντι-
Oneirocr. l. 2. c. 58. † As appeareth by that Relation in Petronius Arbitr: Imperator Provincie Iatro-
nes jussit crucibus affigi. Proxima autem nocte cum miles qui cruce asservabat ne quis ad sepul-
crum corpora detraheret, &c. And when that souldier was absent, Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut
viderunt laxatam custodiam, detraxere nocte pendentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio. Where
we see the souldier set for a guard, and the end of that custodia, (which the Greek Lexicographers do not well
confine to the σελήτιον τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου ἀντικειμένου) to keep the body of him which was crucified from being
buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastned to a Crosse (another example of
the ignominy of his punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: Ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος αἰσίων ταῦτα, ἀποστείλῃ τὸ
μὲν σῶμα τῷ Κλειμένους κρημνίσαι ἐκταφύροισι, &c. Where κρημνίσαι is again to be observed as taken for ἀνταυρού-
σαι for not long after in the same Author it follows, Ὁλίσσας ἡ δὲ νεκρὴ κρημνίσαι, αἱ τὸ σῶμα τῷ Κλειμένους ἀν-
ταυρούμεναι περὶ σφύλαττοντι· εἰδὼν ἱμερῶν δεχόμενα τῇ ἀποκρίσει ἀποπερὶ τὸν σταυρὸν, αἱ
μὲν δὲ ὄρνιθες ἐφ' ἡμέραν σαρκαζόντων. Where we see a guard set to keep him from burial, and the voracious fowls
ready to seize on him, had they not been kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were there souldiers
upon the crucifixion of any person set as a guard, τὸν ἀνταυρούμενον παρεκφυλάττοντες, or ταρπύτες, & cruceam
asservantes, viz. ne quis ad sepulcrum corpus detraheret.

Saviour

Saviour on the Crosse, and the guard was set; there was *the Centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus*. The Centurion returned as soon as Christ was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death: but the watch continueth still. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfill'd? how can this Jonas be convey'd into the belly of the whale? where ^a shall he make his grave with the wicked, or with the rich in his death of crucifixion? By the providence of him who did foretell it, it shall be fulfill'd. They which petition'd that he might be crucified, shall intercede that he may be inter'd. For the † custome of the Jews required, that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their Law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the expresse words of Moses, ^b *If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day*. Upon this general custome and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, ^c *the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the Crosse on the Sabbath day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away*. And this is the first step to the burial of our Saviour.

For though by the common rule of the Roman law, those which were condemned to the crosse were to loose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or † mourning; yet it was in the power of the Magistrate to * indulge the leave of burial: and therefore Pilate, who crucified Christ because the Jews desir'd it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it; he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Now though the Jews had obtained their request of Pilate, though Christ had been thereby certainly buried, yet had not the prediction bin fulfill'd which expressly mentioned the *rich in his death*. For as he was crucified between to thieves, so had he bin buried with them, because by the Jews there was appointed a publick place of burial for all such as suffered as Malefactors.

Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caus'd his crucifixion, ^d *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just, who also himself waited for the kingdome of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews: this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered; he came therefore and took the body of Jesus*.

Beside ^e *there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a Master of Israel; this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrhe aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury*.

And thus was the burial of the Son of God perform'd according

Matth. 27.54.

a Isa. 53.9.

† קבור עשר כל
למנוח אחר כל
דיוני ביום דין
ביום הרגלים:
Maimon. Traict.

Sanh. cap. 15.

So Iosephus.

Τοσαύτως 'Ιου-

δαίαν ἀπὸ τῆς

ταφᾶς μενεσθῆναι

παραμύναν, ὥστε

ἀφαιρῆσαι ἐκ τῆς

ἐκείνης ἀναστα-

σεως: καὶ οὕτως

ἐπαύρηται ἡ αἰ-

σχύς τοῦ τοῦ

δουλοῦ, de

Bel. Iud. l. 14.

c. 18.

b Dent. 21.

22, 13:

c Iohn 19.31:

† Non solent

autem lugeri

(ut Neratius

ait) hostes, vel

perduellionis

damnati, nec

suspensiofi,

nec qui ma-

nus sibi in-

tulerunt non

exadio vi-

tæ, sed mala

conscientia.

Digest. l. 3.

tit. 2. l. Libe-

rorum.

* So Apianus,

l. 9. de officio

Troconsulis:

Corpora eo-

rum qui ca-

pitate damna-

tur cognatis

ipsorum ne-

ganda non

sunt; & id se

observasse et-

iam Divus

Augustus li-

bro decimo

de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur, quam si fuerit petiitum & permittum: & nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum. So Paulus l. 1. Sententiarum: Corpora animadverforum quibuscumque petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subiectos sepulturæ tradi non vetamus, Cod. l. 3. tit. 43. l. 11. d Matth. 27. Mark 15. Luke 23. Iohn 19. e Iohn 3. 1. and 19. 39. 40.

mentioned onely Ioseph and the sindon, with S. Iohn, who addeth Nicodemus and the *ἰσθίνα*. Neque hic aliquid repugnet recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt à solo Ioseph Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone à Ioseph involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi & alia lintea potuisse offerri à Nicodemo & superaddi: ut verum narraret Iohannes quod non uno linteo, sed linteis involutus sit; quamvis & propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, & institas quibus totum corpus alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiam si una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, *ligaverunt eum linteis*. De consensu Evang. l. 3. c. 23. *These, which he calls institas quibus totum corpus alligatum est, were the חרית, חרית, involucra mortui. Beside these, we read in the history of Lazarus, ἡ ἑστὴ αὐτοῦ σινδών, ἡ ἑστὴ αὐτοῦ, Iohn 11. 44. and of our Saviour, καὶ τὸ σινδώνον ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ. The same is rendered by the Syriack word, Καὶ λινθὴν πεπλεγμένην ἀνδρὶ μυστακὶ κολληθεὶς κόρον, Σινδῶνα τὸ πρὸς τῇ Σινδῶνι ὅμοια. Whereas the word is not of a Syriack, but Latine origination, and from the Latines came to the Greek and Eastern people: Sudor and Sudare, from thence Sudarium. Varius reus, agente in eum Calvo, sudario candido frontem deterlit. *Quintil.* Suetonius of Nero, Plerumque prodiit in publicum ligato circa collum sudario. This was translated into their own language by the later Greeks, to signify that which before was called ἡμυτίβιον and καλιδριόν, as is observed by Iulius Pollux. Τὸ δὲ ἡμυτίβιον, ἔστι μὲν αὐτὸ τὸ αἰγυπτιῶδες ἑστὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κεφαλῆς καλιδριόν, ὃ νῦν Σινδῶνα ὀνομαζέται. Αἰγυπτιακοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ Πάρις τὸ αὐτὸν καλεῖται. Ἐπειτα καὶ τὸν ἡμυτίβιον καλεῖται. Τὰ βλίσφαρα περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν, is the same with that in *Quintilian*, frontem deterlit; ἡμυτίβιον then was the same with Sudarium. So the *Scholiast* upon that place: ἡμυτίβιον ἑστὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κεφαλῆς, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἡμυτίβιον. This is the proper signification of Σινδῶνα, viz, a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriack language, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use. As *Ruth* 3. 15. Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee; the Chaldee rendereth it, רב, סודרה רי עליך, and it held six measures of barley. So, when Moses is said to put a veil on his face, *Exod.* 34. 33. the Chaldee again rendereth it סודרה אפני משה. So the Rabbins ordinarily use סודרה על פניו the veil or covering of his head; and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the Etymology, as Nonnus conceiv'd in those words, Σινδῶνα καλιδριόν καλιδριόν, as if Lazarus had come sweating out of his grave; but the onely use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the *Epistle of Marcialis* calls sudarium mortuorum.*

As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custome of the Jews was also punctually observ'd in that. Ioseph of Arimathea had prepar'd a place of burial for himself and the manner of it is express'd. For in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein never man was laid, which Ioseph had hewen out of the rock for his own tombe; here layd they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre: and so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a Vault made by the † excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, and that Vault

Math. 27.

Mark 15.

† Strabo observeth of Ierusalem, that the

ground about it, ἐπὶ τῇ ἰερουσαλὴμ, was ἀπέριστη, for nine miles rocky underneath. It is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Ierusalem there should be found ground which was petrosa. It is said therefore of Ioseph, that μνημεῖον ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα of the sepulchre, that ἡ ἡλασμένη ἐστὶν πέτρα, and ἡλασμένον, which signifie no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of ἡλασμένον onely; Ἐν ἐν γέγονε καὶ τὸ Τύμβον ἀδωμένον βαθυμενὸν ἀπὸ πέτρης ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα. Where βαθυμενὸν signifies the excavation of the rock, and ἡλασμένον the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or exculpion. But *Salmasius* hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art of stone within it. And this interpretation he endeavours to prove out of the text: first, alledging that πέτρα signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock; and therefore ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα is ἐκ λίθου, made of stone: otherwise the Articles would have been added, ἐν τῇ πέτρῃ, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in S. Matthew the Article is expressly added, ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα. S. Matthew therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again he objects, that ἡλασμένον signifies not onely lapides ex lapidicina cadere, but also polire & quadrare ad ædificandum; and ἡλασμένον signifies the last onely. Wherefore being it is said not onely ἡλασμένον, which may be understood of building, but also ἡλασμένον, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes, that it was a Vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of ἡλασμένον, which may be extended to any sense of ἡλασμένον, (as Origen indifferently ἡλασμένον ἢ ἡλασμένον μνημεῖον ἐστὶν πέτρα) and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custome, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custome, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word חב by ἡλασμένον, as 1 King. 5. 15. חב חב ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα. Isa. 51. חב חב חב, ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα, ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα, unde excili. As therefore Deut. 6. 11. ἡλασμένον ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα, so Isa. 22. 16. Ὅτι ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα, ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα, ἡλασμένον ἐστὶν πέτρα: in both places ἡλασμένον is nothing else but חב, and there μνημεῖον ἡλασμένον in the language of the Jews is to be taken secured

in the same sense with λαβὴν ἀλλοτρίαν, that is, digged or hew'n out of the ground. This is well expressed by Orig. Ἡ ταρὴ ἔχει τὴν ἡμετέραν διὰ τὴν Συμβολικὴν διακρίσιν ἐν τῇ διακρίσει αὐτῇ τὸ Κάμα ἐκ μεταίᾳ καὶ τῷ ὑποκρίν. καὶ ἐκ λαβάνων λίθων ἀποδομῶνται, καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐφυστὴν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς δι' ἑαυτὴν ἡμετέρας λατομίας καὶ λαβάνων. 1. 2. adu. Celsum. And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very material in the opinion of S. Jerome, who makes this observation on Mat. 27. In monumento novo quod excisum fuerat ἐκ πέτρας, conditus est, ne si ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatus furto diceretur; and gives this interpretation of the Prophet Isaiah. Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus esset, Prophetæ testimonium est dicentis, Hic habitabit in excisa spelunca petra fortissima: statimq; post duos versiculos sequitur, Regem cum gloria videbitis. Another use of the same supposition is made likewise by S. Ambrose. Domini corpus tanquam per Apostolorum doctrinam infertur in vacuum & in novam requiem lapidis excisi; scilicet in pectus duritiæ gentilis quodam doctrinæ opere excisum Christus infertur, rude scilicet ac novum, & nullo antea ingressu timoris Dei pervium, in Matth. Can. 33. Thus was the Sepulchre prepared for the body: and when Joseph had laid it there, ἀποστρώσαντες λίθον λίθον, καὶ τὸν δούλον, he rolled a great stone to the door, the last part of that solemnity. For this great stone was said to be rolled, by reason of the bignesse, as being not portable, (from whence arose the womens doubt, Mark. 16. 3. Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? and that very properly, for it had it's name from that rolling, being called constantly by the Jews γόλι, or γόλι from γόλιν, volvere, אבן גדולה ורחבה שמונים ברה מ'קבר מלמעלה מלסן וגללו אחת, Obadiah de Bartenora.

secured from external injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was perform'd, and the sepulture completed: so that it was not * lawfull by the custome of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre, or disturbe the interred body.

Thirdly, two eminent persons did concur unto the burial of our Saviour, a † Ruler and a Counsellour, men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people; Joseph of Arimathea, rich and honourable, and yet inferiour to Nicodemus, one of the great Council of the Sanhedrim: these two, though fearful while he lived, to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of providence to interre him; that so the prediction might be fulfilled which was delivered by Isaiah, to this purpose. The counsel of his enemies, the design of the Jews, ^a made his grave with the wicked, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him: but because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, because he was no way guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered; that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsel of his Father, the design of heaven put him with the rich in his death, and caus'd a Counsellour and a Ruler of the Jews to bury him.

The necessity of this part of the Article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth, both of Christs death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they dye: Pilate was very inquisitive, whether our Saviour ^b had been any while dead, and was fully satisfied by the Centurion, before he would give the body to Joseph to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never dyed, nor can there be a true Resurrection, where there hath not been a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe in Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he dyed; and a greater assurance of his death then this we cannot have, that his body was deliver'd by his enemies from the crosse, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Secondly, a profession to believe that Christ was buried is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his burial. For we are ^c buried with him in Baptism, even ^d buried with him by Baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father,

* This hath been observed by the Jews themselves,

אסור לפתוח הקבר אחר שנקמה חגול: It is prohibited for any man to open the sepulchre after it is shut with the rolled stone.

† So they are stiled in the Scriptures, Joseph βασιλευς, & Nicodemus ἀρχων: & these two powers ruled all then at Jerusalem under the Romans. As appeared when Agrippa prevented a war by the sudden raising of a

Tax. Εἰς τὸ καίρας οἱ τοὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βασιλεὺς παρεδίδοντες φόβον Καίσαρος. Joseph. 1. 2. c. 29.

a Isa. 53. 9.

b Mark 15.

44. 45.

c Colos. 2. 12.

d Rom. 6. 4.

ARTICLE V.

He descended into hell: the third day he rose again from the dead.

THe former part of this Article, of the *Descent into Hell*, hath not been so † anciently in the Creed, or so universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in, was the Church of Aquileia; and the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was lesse then 400 years after Christ. After that it came into the * Roman Creed, and † others, and hath been acknowledged as a part of the Apostolic Creed ever since.

Indeed the *Descent into Hell* hath * alwayes been accepted, but with a various exposition: and the Church of England at the Reformation, as it receiv'd the three Creeds, in two of which this Article is contained, so did it also make this one of the Articles of Religion, to which all who are admitted to any Benefice or received into holy Orders are obliged to subscribe. And at the first reception it was propounded with a certain Explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King Edward the sixth, with reference to an expresse place of Scripture interpreted of this *Descent*. * *That the body of Christ lay in the grave untill his Resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up there, was thrust in out of clemens his constitutions.* In the like manner, in vain is it objected, that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clemens Romanus, and Iustin Martyr, because they have not pretended any Rule of Faith, or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, It is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by Irenaeus, lib. 1. cap. 2. by Origen, lib. ad. ap. in prae. or by Tertullian advers. Praxean, cap. 2. de Virg. veland. cap. 1. de Praescript. adv. Hæret. cap. 13. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles Creed: not in the Nicene, or Constantinopolitane; nor in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; nor in those Confessions made at Sardica, Arimin. Seleucia, Sirmium, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Caesariensis presented to the Council of Nice, Theodoret. l. 1. c. 2. not in that of Macarius Bishop of Ankyra delivered to Pope Julius, Epiphani. Har. 72. not in that of Arius and Euzoius presented to Constantine, Sozat. l. 1. c. 19. not in that of Acacius Bishop of Caesarea delivered into the Synod of Seleucia, Sozat. l. 2. c. 40. not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus and Silvanus, sent to Liberius, Sozat. l. 2. c. 12. There is no mention of it in the Creed of S. Basil, Tract. de Fide in Aeternis: in the Creed of Epiphanius, in Ancor. c. 12. c. Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by S. Cyril. (though some have produced that Creed to prove it;) it is not in the Creed expounded by S. Augustine, de Fide et Symbolo; nor in that De Symbolo ad catechumenos, attributed to S. Augustine; nor in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the church of Antioch delivered by cassianus, de Incarn. l. 6. neither is it to be seen in the MSS. Creeds set forth by the learned Arch Bishop of Armagh. Indeed it is affirmed by Rufinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental Creeds: Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiae Romanae symbolo non habetur descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. Ruff. in Exposit. Sym. vi. It is certain therefore, (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity) that the Article of the descent into hell was not in the Roman, or any of the Oriental Creeds. * That the Descent into hell came afterwards into the Roman Creed appeareth, not onely because we find it there of late; but because we find it often in the Latine Church many ages since. As in that produced by Eucherius against Eupandus in the year 786. in the 115. Sermon de Tempore falsely ascribed to S. Augustine, where it is attributed to S. Thomas the Apostle. In the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to S. Chrysostome. † As in the Creed attributed to Athanasius, which though we cannot say was his, yet we know was ancient about the year 600. by the Epistle of Isidorus Hispalensis ad claudium Ducem. It was also inserted into the Creed of the Council of Ariminum, Soz. l. 2. c. 37. and of the fourth Council of Toledo held in the year 633. and of the sixteenth Council of the same Toledo held in the year 693. * Quis nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum? S. Aug. Ep. 99. 21 Per. 3. 19. Nam Corpus usque ad Resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit; Spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in Carcere sive in Inferno detinebantur fuit, illique predicavit, ut testatur Petri locus, &c. Articuli an. 1552. which place was also made use of in the Exposition of the Creed contained in the catechisme set forth by the Authority of King Edward in the seventh year of his reign.

† First, it is to be observed, that the Descent into Hell was not in the ancient Creeds or Rules of Faith. Some tell us that it was not in the Confession of Ignatius. Ep. ad Magnes. But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that Epistle; for what is read

was with the spirits which were detain'd in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in S. Peter testifieth. So likewise after the same manner in the Creed set forth in Meeter after the manner of a Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this stasse,

And so he dyed in the flesh,
But quickned in the spirit;
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.

His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darknesse were
The true light of their hearts.

But in the Synod ten years after, in the dayes of Queen Elizabeth, the Articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same Descendit, but without any the least explication, or reference to any particular place of Scripture, in these words. *As Christ dyed for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into Hell.* Wherefore being our Church hath not now imposed that interpretation of S. Peter's words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the onely place of Scripture to found the *Descent into Hell* upon; being it hath alleaged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it: we may with the greater liberty passe out to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgement in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

Article 3.
1562.

† Descendit
in inferna, or
ad inferna, is
the general
writing in the
Ancient Mss.
as the learned
Archbishop testifieth of those

in the Benedicte and Cottonian Libraries, to which I may adde those in the Library at Westminster: we see the same likewise in that of Elipandus, Descendit ad inferna. Which words are so recited in the Creed delivered in the Catechisme set forth by the Authority of Edward the 6. A.D. 1553. * So the Ancient Ms. in Bennet Colledge Library, Καταβόλα εἰς τὰ κατωτάτα, and the Confession made ad Sirmium, εἰς τὰ κατωχρόνιστα κατωχρόνιστα. Since that, it is, Descendit ad inferos, and καταβόλα εἰς ἄδου, or Descendit ad infernum, as Venantius Fortunatus. For τὰ κατωτάτα is a fit interpretation, if we take inferna according to the Vulgar Etymology, as S. Augustine, Inferi eo quod infra sint Latine appellantur, De Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. 34. Or as Nonius Marcellus, Inferum ab imo dictum, unde inferi quibus inferius nihil. Again, Inferna may well be translated ἄδου, if it be taken according to the true Origination, which is from the Greek ἄδης, with the Holic digamma, from which Dialect most of the Latine language came. * *Ἄδης*, Inferi. Now ἄδης according to the Greek composition is nothing else but ἀνέχθης. Etym. * *Ἄδης*, εἰς ἡλύον, ὅθεν τὸ ἐν τῇ ἡλύᾳ καὶ ἄδης· ὁ ἴσιν ἐν τῇ γῇ. and Suid. * *Ἐρῆος*, ἡλύος, ὅθεν τὸ ἐν τῇ ἡλύᾳ καὶ ἄδης. * *Ἐρῆ* is anciently the earth, from whence ἡλύος, χαμῶς, to the earth; ἡλύος then are in the earth, as they supposed the Manes or Spirits of the dead to be; from whence Homer. Iliad. δ'· Ἄδης ἡλύος ἐν ἀνάσσει, of Pluto; & Hesiod. Τῆος Ἄδης· εἰς οὗτος καταβήσαντες ἀνάσσει. and in imitation of them Æschylus in Persis, Τῆος καὶ Ἐρῆος, ἑσπέρων τ' εἰσπέρων, Περσέων ἡλύος καὶ εἰς ἄδου. Thus ἡλύος are those which Æschylus elsewhere calls τὸς γὰρ ἡλύος καὶ τὸς γὰρ ἡλύος. And as ἡλύος the souls of the dead in the earth, so are Inferi in the first acception, that is Manes. Pomponius Mela, Augilæ manes tantum Deos putant, which Pliny delivers thus, Augilæ inferos tantum colunt; and Solinus, Augilæ vero solos colunt inferos. Inferi were then first ἡλύος, the souls of men in the earth: and as Manes is not onely that for the souls below, but also for the place, as in the Poet.

and Hæc Manes veniat mihi fama sub imos;

so Inferi is most frequently used for the place under ground, where the souls departed are: and the inferna must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations; and so Descendit ad inferna, καταβόλα εἰς ἄδου, and Descendit ad Inferos are the same.

the

the first with relation to S. Peters words of Christ, *a Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*; the second referring to that of S. Paul, *b He descended into the lower parts of the earth*.

Secondly, I observe that in the Aquileian Creed, where this Article was first express'd, there was no mention of Christs burial; but the words of their confession ran thus, *† crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended in inferna*. From whence there is no question but the observation of Ruffinus, who first expounded it, was most true, that though the Roman and Oriental Creeds had not their words, yet they had the sense of them in the word *buried*. It appeareth therefore that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was onely to expresse the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the Aquileian Creed to signifie the burial of Christ, and those which had onely the burial in their Creed did confess as much as those which without the burial did expresse the *Descent*; yet since the Roman Creed hath added the *descent* unto the *burial*, and express'd that descent by words signifying more properly *hell*, it cannot be imagin'd that the Creed, as now it stands, should signify onely the burial of Christ by his descent into hell. But rather being the Ancient Church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend, beside his burial; though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviours death, makes mention of his descent into Hell, beside, and * distinct from, his sepulture; being those who in after ages added it to the burial did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended; it followeth that for the Exposition of the Creed it is most necessary to declare in what that Descent consisteth.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them: and the general consent of the Church of God. Now these words as they lie in the Creed, *he descended into Hell*, are no where formally and ex-

from the dead. Nor is this onely observable in these two, but also in the Creed made at Sirmium, and produced at Ariminum, in which the words run thus, *καταβήντα, ἡ κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα*. Where though the Descent be express'd, and the Burial be not mentioned, yet it is most certain, those men which made it (Hereticks indeed, but not in this) did not understand his burial by that descent; and that appears by addition of the following words, *εἰς τὴν κατὰ ἄβυσσον κατέβητα, κατὰ τὴν ἀβυσσον κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα, ἡ κατέβητα*. For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave, nor could the keepers of the gates of Hell be affrighted with any sight of his corps lying in the sepulchre.

For having produced many places of Scripture to prove the Circumstances of our Saviours death: and having cited those particularly which did belong unto his burial, he passes further to his Descent in these words. Sed & quod in infernum descendit evidenter prænuntiatur in Psalmis, ubi dicit, *Et in pulverem meris deduxisti me*. Et iterum. *Quæ utilitas in sanguine meo dum descendo in corruptionem?* & iterum. *Descendisti in limbum profundum, & non est substantia*. Sed & Matthæus dicit. *Tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus?* Unde & Petrus dixit, *Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu*. In ipso, ait, *et ei qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe: in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur*. Sed & ipse Dominus per Prophetam dicit tanquam de futuro: *Quia non derelinques animam meam in inferno, nec dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem: quod rursus prophetice nihilominus ostendit impletum cum dicit: Domine eduxisti ab inferno animam meam, salvasti me a descendentibus in Lacum*. Whence it appeareth that though Ruffinus thought that the sense of descendit ad inferna was express'd in sepultus est, yet he did distinguish the Doctrine of Christs Descent into hell from that of his Buriall.

a Acts 2. 27.

b Ephes. 4. 9.

† So are the words cited in Ruffinus, Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna.

And his Observation upon them is this, Sciendum

sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ

Symbolo non habetur additum, Descen-

dit ad inferna: sed neque in

Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic Ser-

mo; vis tamen verbi eadem videtur

esse in eo quod sepultus est. Expos.

Symb. The same may also be observed in

the Athanasian Creed, which has the

Descent but not the sepul-

ture; Who suffered for our salvation,

descended into hell, rose again the

third day

presly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in expresse & plain terms that Christ, as he dyed and was buried, so *he descended into hell*. Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expresse'd in the Scripture, our enquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into hell*.

Now several places of Scripture have been produced by the Ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not: but three there are which have been alwayes thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, that of S. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to expresse the same almost in † terms. *Now that he ascended what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* This many of the ancient * Fathers understood of the Descent into hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the Earth: and this exposition must be confesse'd so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those lower parts of the earth may signifie hell, and Christs descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the Apostle intended so much in those words, the place it self will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ, which S. Paul speaketh of, was performed after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the lower parts of the earth did signifie hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written, *a No man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven*, so this may signifie so much, and no more, *In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first?* And for the lower parts of the earth, they may possibly signifie no more then the place beneath; as when our Saviour said, *b Ye are from beneath, I am from above: ye are of this world, I am not of this world*: or as God spake by the Prophet, *I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signes in the earth beneath*. Nay they may well referre to his Incarnation, according to that of David, *c My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth*: or to his Burial, according to that of the Prophet, *d Those that seek my soul to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth*; and these two references have a great similitude, according to that of Job, *e Naked came I out of my mothers wombe, and naked shall I return thither*.

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the Descent, is not so near in words, but thought to signifie the end of that Descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith S. Peter, was put to death in the flesh and quickned by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: where the Spirit seems to be the soul of Christ; and the spirits in prison, the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least separated from the

Ephes. 4. 9.
† For the first
expression
which we find
in Rufinus,
Descendit in
inferna, comes
most near to
this quotation;
especially if
we take the
ancient Greek
Translation of
it, κατωβήτω
εἰς τὰ κατώτατα.
For if we con-
sider that κα-
τώτατα may
well have the
signification of
the superla-
tive, especial-
ly being the
LXX hath so
translated
Psal. 63. 9.
εἰσαβύσσῳ εἰς
τὰ κατώτατα τῆς
γῆς and
Psal. 139. 15.
καὶ ἐκ τῆς κατω-
τάτης τῆς γῆς
what can be
nearer then
these two, κα-
τωβήτω εἰς τὰ
κατώτατα, and
κατωβῆς εἰς τὰ
κατώτατα; or
these two,
κατωβήτω εἰς
τὰ κατωβύβητα,
and, κατωβή-
τω εἰς τὰ κατωβύβητα ὑπὸν τῆς γῆς; * This appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove, or expresse, the De-
scend into Hell, as Irenæus does, l. 5. c. 26. Origen Hom. 35. in Matth. Athanasius Epist. ad Epiphrosum.
Hilarius in Psal. 67. S. Ierome upon the place, Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Do-
minus nosse Salvatorque descendit. So also the Commentary attributed to S. Ambrose. and S. Hilary.
Si itaque hæc omnia Christus unus est, neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus, aut alius
descendens ad inferna, & alius ascendens in cælos, secundum illud Apostoli, Ascendit autem quid
est, &c. De Trinit. l. 10. a Iohn 3. 13. b Iohn 8. 23. c Psal. 119. 15. d Psal. 63. 9. e Job 1. 21.

joyes

joyes of heaven: whither because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the crosse. This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the Descent, and the ancient Fathers did apply the same in the like manner to the proof of this Article. But yet those words of S. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the spirit there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they † staggered S. Augustine, and caused him at last to think that these words of S. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christs descending into Hell. But indeed the spirit by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that Spirit by which he was quickened; as appeareth by the coherence of the words, *being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.* Now that Spirit by which Christ was quickned, is * that by which he was raised from the dead, that is the power of his divinity; as S. Paul expresth it, *Though he was crucified through weaknesse, yet he liveth by the power of God:* in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the dayes of Noah, as we have .: already shewen.

The third but principal Text is that of David, applied by S. Peter. For *b David speaking concerning him, I foresaw the Lord alwayes before my face, for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.* Thus the Apostle repeated the words of the Psalmist, and then applied them. *He being a Prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.* Now from this place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus; If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection: But it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell, and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver, that Christ being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by vertue of that promise and propheticall expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope untill his resurrection; so his soul which was not left in hell, by vertue of the like promise or potueris, five aliquem qui possit inveneris, auferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam. Then setting down in order all the difficulties which occur'd at that time in that Exposition of the Descent into hell, He concludes with an Exposition of another nature. Considera tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de con- clusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit. * Quid est enim quod vivificatus est spiritus, nisi quod eadem caro qua sola fuerat mortificatus, vivificante spiritu resurrexit? Nam quod fuerat anima mortificatus Iesus, hoc est, eo spiritu qui hominis est, quis audeat dicere? cum mors animæ non sit nisi peccatum, à quo ille omnino immunis fuit cum pro nobis carne mortificaretur. S. Aug. Epist. 99. & ibid. Certe anima Christi non solum immortalis secundum caterarum naturam, sed etiam nullo mortificata peccato vel damnatione punita est; quibus duabus causis mors animæ intelligi potest, & ideo non secundum ipsam dici potuit Christus vivificatus spiritum. In ea re quippe vivificatus est in qua fuerat mortificatus. Ergo de carne dictum est: ipsa enim revixit anima redeunte, quia ipsa erat mortua anima recedente. Mortificatus ergo carne dictus est, quia secundum solam carnem mortuus est: vivificatus autem spiritum, quia illo spiritu operante, in quo ad quos (leg. eos) veniebat & prædicabat, etiam ipsa caro vivificata resurrexit, in qua modo ad homines venit. .: Pag. 124, 125. a 2 Cor. 13. 4. b Act. 2. 35, 26, 27, 30, 31. predi-

† As Hermes

l. 3. Simil. 9.

Irenæus l. 4.

c. 45. Clemens

Alex. Stromat.

l. 6. Orig. Hom.

35. in Matthæ

S. Athanas. l.

de Incarn. E-

piphani. Hæres.

77. S. Cyril de

recta fide ad

Theodosium,

l. 12. in Iohan-

nem. Orat.

Pasch. & alibi

sæpius. Au-

thor comment.

Ambros. a-

script. ad Rom.

10. Ruff. in

Explic. Symb.

† For in 'his

Answer to

Euodius, Ep. 99

He thus begins,

Quæstio quâ

mihi propo-

suiisti ex Epi-

stola Aposto-

li Petri, solet

nos, ut te la-

tere non ar-

bitror, vehe-

mentissime

commovere,

quomodo illa

verba accipi-

enda sint tan-

quam de infe-

ris dicta. Re-

plico ergo ti-

bi eandem

quæstionem,

ut live ipse

* Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in infernum satis constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno* (Quod ne aliter quisquâ sapere aude- ret, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit) vel ejusdem Petri illis verbis quibus eum affert soluisse inferni dolores, in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum? *Epist. 99.*
 † Cum Articulus sit, Christum ad Inferos descendisse, & non possit intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quam est ubique; nec ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulchro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animæ, quo supposito, videndum est qualiter anima Christi descendit ad infernum, *Durand. l. 3. dist. 22. q. 3.*

prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, untill the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must therefore confesse from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith S. Augustine, * it is so clearly delivered in this prophesie of the Psalmist, and application of the Apostle.

The onely Question then remains, not of the truth of the Proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ descended into Hell, and as infallibly true as any other Article of the Creed; but what that Hell was, and how he descended thither, being once question'd is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an Exposition of the Creed as now it stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained. I must therefore look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the Creed, and may withal be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: And consequently, whatsoever Interpretation is either not true in it self, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not conformable to the doctrine of the Apostle in this particular, the Expofitor of that Creed by the doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus; who, as often, so in this, is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong † unto the soul, and the name of Hell to signifie the place where the souls of dead men were in custody: but he maketh a metaphor in the word descended, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were; but onely including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in Hell: and because the merit of Christs death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent, and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to descend into Hell, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the Exposition of this Article; being neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of so great Scholastic subtilty, nor the place of David expounded by S. Peter can possibly admit any such explication. For what can be the sense of those words, *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, if his being in hell was onely virtually acting there? If the efficacy of his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion therefore of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected as not expofitive of the Creeds confession, nor consistent with the Scriptures expression.

The next Opinion later then that of Durandus, is, that the

† De-

† Descent into Hell is the suffering of the torments of hell; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatned by the Law unto them which depart this life in their sinnes and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and born by Christ; that he dyed a true and natural death, the death of Gehenna; and this dying the death of Gehenna was the *descending into Hell*; That those which are now saved by virtue of his death, should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned doe and shall endure, but that he being their surety, did himself suffer the same for them; even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This Interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the Exposition of this Article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formal sense; for in that acception it is not true. It must not, it cannot be admitted, that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer; and therefore it is not, it cannot be true, that by suffering them he descended into Hell. There is a worm that never dyeth, which could not lodge within his breast, that is, a remorse of conscience seated in the soul for what that soul hath done: but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the sins and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God, but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the souls condemned to eternal flames. Again, an essential part of the torments of Hell, is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour and avoiding pain; an absolute and compleat despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation. But Christ we know had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the crosse, & offered up himself a sweet smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any damned soul to have received an expresse promise of God, that after 10000 years he would release him from those torments and make him everlastingly happy, and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternal life; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that Hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins: because hope and confidence and relying upon God would not onely mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a Covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more then he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion then he had himself determined;

† *calvin Instit. l. 2. c. 16. § 10. Si Christus ad inferos descendisse dicitur nihil mirum est, cum eam mortem per-tulerit quæ sceleribus ab irato Deo infligitur; which he expresseth presently in another phrase, cum ditros in anima cruciatus damnati ac periti hominis pertulerit.*

Quid igitur? Christus persona sua secundum humanitatem poenam gehennalem nobis debitam passus est; anima principaliter, corpore secundario, utroque causaliter ad merendum, ad nos suo ipsius merito liberandos, Parkerus de Descensu, l. 3. § 43. & statim §. 49. Descendisse namque Servatorem, modo supra memorato, ad Haden mortis gehennalis innumeris patet argumentis.

he

he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of Hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of Hell.

Again, if we take the torments of Hell in a Metaphorical sense, for those terrors and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernal torments, because they are of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men; yet this cannot be an Interpretation of the Descent into Hell, as it is an Article of the Creed, and as that Article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such) were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the Crosse: but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the Ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident, that the Descent into hell, as it stands now in the Creed, signifieth something commenced after his death, contra-distinguished to his burial; and as it is considered in the Apostles explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his resurrection; and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains. For it is thus particularly expressed, *I foresaw the Lord alwayes before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce: and my tongue was glad. Moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: where the faith, hope, confidence, and assurance of Christ is shewn, and his flesh, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to rest in hope, for this very reason because God would not leave his soul in hell. I conclude therefore, that the Descent into Hell is not the enduring the torments of Hell: because if strictly taken, it is not true; if Metaphorically taken, though it be true, yet it is not pertinent.*

The third Opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, the Soul of Christ is taken for his body, and Hell for the grave; and consequently, in the Creed, *He descended into hell*, is no more then this, that Christ in his body was laid into the grave. This Explication ordinarily is rejected, by denying that the soul is ever taken for the body, or hell for the grave; but in vain: for it must be acknowledged that sometimes the Scriptures are rightly so, and cannot otherwise be understood. First, the same word in the † Hebrew, which the Psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the Apostle used, and we translate *the soul*, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man,

† The Hebrew word is נפש. & the Greek ψυχή.

לֹא תִּשָּׁאֵל אֶת נַפְשִׁי מִיָּד ה' (Psalm 116. 10). But both נפש and ψυχή are used for the body of a dead man, Numb. 6. 6. and it is so translated; For Moses speaking there of a Nazarite, gives this law, All the dayes that he separateth himself unto the Lord, he shall come at no dead body, in the Original כִּי יָמָא לֹא יָבֹא אֶל מֵת, and in the LXX καὶ οὐκ ἅψεται τινος νεκροῦ. In the same manner the law for the High-Priest, Levit. 21. 11. Neither shall he go in to any dead body, כִּי נֶפֶשׁ וְעַל נֶפֶשׁ לֹא יָבֹא, καὶ ἐπὶ ψυχῇ τινος νεκροῦ οὐκ ἐπιθήσεται. And the general law, Lev. 22. 4. And who so toucheth any thing that is unclean by the dead, וְהַנֶּגַע בְּכָל נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר אֲמַלְאִי מֵמֵת דֹּמָם דֹּמָם, which is further cleared by that of Numb. 12. 11. He that toucheth the dead body of any man, Qui tetigerit cadaver hominis; and verse 3. Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead. Omnis qui tetigerit humanæ animæ morticinum: therefore the נפש and ψυχή in Lev. 22. 4. doe signifie the cadaver or morticinum; as also Num. 5. 2. Whosoever is defiled by the dead, כִּי נֶפֶשׁ מֵת

and

significations in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*; and consequently, the Article grounded on that Scripture must import no more then this, Christ in respect of his body bereft of his soul, which was recommended into, and deposited in the hands of his Father, *descended into the grave*.

This Exposition hath that great advantage, that he which first mentioned this Descent in the Creed did interpret it of the Burial; and where this Article was expressed there that of the Burial was omitted. But notwithstanding those advantages, there is no certainty of this Interpretation: First, because * he which did so first interpret it, at the same time and in the tenure of that expression, did acknowledge a descent of the soul of Christ into hell; and those other † Creeds which did likewise omit the burial and expresse the descent, did shew that by that Descent they understood not that of the body but of the soul. Secondly, because they which put these words into the Roman Creed, in which the burial was express'd before, must certainly understand a Descent distinct from that; and therefore though it might perhaps be thought a probable interpretation of the words of David, especially taken as belonging to David, yet it cannot pretend to an Exposition of the Creed, as now it stands.

The next opinion is, that the Soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguish'd from the body; or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is; or for the living soul as it is distinguish'd from the immortal spirit: but then the term *Hell* shall signify no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor the soul; but only the state or condition of men in death during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the Prophecie shall run thus, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my natural life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vital faculty: And then the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was *crucified, dead, and buried*, and *descended into Hell*, that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men doe.

But this interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *Hades* signifieth not death it self, nor the place where soules departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permanfion in death; which is a Notion wholly new, and consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the notions and conceptions of those times. And that this Notion is wholly new, will appear, because not any of the ancient Fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen Authors which are produced do affirm it: Nay, it is evident that the Greeks did alwayes by *Hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed, distinct and separate from that place in which we live, and that their different opinions shew, placing it in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *Hades* in the judgement of the ancient Greeks cannot consist in this notion of the state of death, and the permanfion in that condition, because there were many which they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, which yet they

* Rufinus, who first mentioned this Article, did interpret it of the grave, as we have already observed, but yet he did believe a Descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed. Sed & quod in infernum descendit, evidenter præ-nunciatur in Psalmis. &c. and then citing that of S. Peter. Unde & Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu, In ipso ait, Et eis qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe, in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur, as we before more largely cited the same place. † I shewed before, that in the Creed made at Sirminum there was the Descent mentioned, and the burial omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed, that it could not be taken for the burial: besides now I adde, that it was made by the Arians, who in few years before had given in another Creed, in which both the Burial and the Descent were mentioned; as that of Nice in Thracia, *καταβύθια, καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ καλαχθῆντα καὶ ἀνὰ δόλῳ ἐκείνῳ*, Theodoret. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 21. and not long after gave in another at Constantinople to the same purpose, *καταβύθια, καὶ ἀνὰ δόλῳ ἐκείνῳ*, Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 4.

believed

such notion, as the state of death and the permanſion of the dead in that ſtate, they needed not to have fallen into doubts or queſtions; the Patriarchs and the Prophets being as certainly in the ſtate of death and remaining ſo, as Corah, Dathan, and Abiram are, or any perſon which is certainly condemned to everlaſting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true, that Chriſt did truly and properly dye, as other men are wont to doe, and that after expiration he was in the ſtate or condition of the dead; in deadlihood, as ſome have learnt to ſpeak; yet the Creed had ſpoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he *was dead*. And although 'tis true that he might have dyed, and in the next minute of time reviv'd, and conſequently his death not, precisely taken, ſignifie any permanſion or duration in the ſtate of death, and therefore it might be added, *he deſcended into hell*, to ſignifie further a permanſion or duration in that condition; yet if *Hell* doe ſignifie nothing elſe but the ſtate of the dead, as this opinion doth ſuppoſe, then to *deſcend into hell*, is no more then to be dead, and ſo notwithstanding any duration employed in that expreſſion, Chriſt might have aſcended the next minute after he deſcended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he dyed. Being then to *deſcend into Hell*, according to this interpretation, is no more then to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that perſon was dead who dyed; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Chriſt dyed, or as we render it, *was dead*; we cannot imagine but they which did adde this part of the Article to the Creed, did intend ſomething more then this, and therefore we cannot admit this Notion, as a full or proper Expoſition.

There is yet left another Interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the Church of Chriſt in all ages, and upon a probable expoſition of the Prophecy of the Pſalmiſt, taking the *ſoul* in the moſt proper ſenſe, for the ſpirit or rational part of Chriſt; that part of man which according to our Saviours doctrine the Jews could not kill; and looking upon *hell* as a place diſtinct from this part of the world where we live, and diſtinguiſhed from thoſe heavens whether Chriſt aſcended, into which place the ſouls of men were conveyed after or upon their death: and therefore thus expounding the words of the Pſalmiſt in the perſon of Chriſt. Thou ſhalt not ſuffer that ſoul of mine, which ſhall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the croſſe, but reſigned into thy hands, when it ſhall goe into that place below where the ſoules of men departed are detained; I ſay, thou ſhalt not ſuffer that ſoul to continue their as theirs have done; but ſhalt bring it ſhortly from thence and reunite it to my body.

For the better underſtanding of this Expoſition, there are ſeveral things to be obſerved, both in reſpect of the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the Fathers. Firſt therefore, this muſt be laid down as a certain and neceſſary truth, that the ſoul of man, when he dyeth, dyeth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be diſpoſed of at his will and pleaſure, according to the ground of our Saviours counſel, *Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the ſoul*. That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exiſt and live, either by vertue of it's ſpiritual and immortal nature, as we believe, or at leaſt the will of God, and his power upholding and preſerving it from diſſolution, as many of the Fathers thought. This ſoul thus exiſting after death, and ſeparated from the body, though of a nature ſpiritual, is really and truly in ſome place; if not by way of circumscription as proper bodies are, yet by way
of

of determination and indistancy, so that it is true to say, this is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again, the soul of man, which while he lived gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vitall actions, in that separate existence after death must not be conceiv'd to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the soules of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace, and rest, in joy, and happinesse, others by the justice of the same God, left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour's death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there was two societies of soules after death, one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their finnes, and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous Abel the first man placed in this happinesse, and the soules of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever was of the sons of Adam which first dyed in his finnes, was put into a place of torment; and the soules of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them, were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the soules at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies, so the place where they are in rest or misery after death, is certainly distinct from the place in which they liv'd. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not goe together with the body to the grave, but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle, or habitation, and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the soul doth certainly passe by a real motion from that place in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place, and unto that society, which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to enquire into the difference and distance of those several habitations (but for method sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the Infernal parts, or the Mansions below) it will appear to have been the general judgement of the Church, that the soul of Christ contradistinguished from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his rational and intellectual soul, after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below, where the soules of men before departed were detained; and that by such a real translation of his soul he was truly said to have descended into Hell.

Many have been the Interpretations of the opinion of the Fathers made of late; and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more then this which I have already affirm'd, the real descent of the soul of Christ unto the habitation of the soules departed. The persons to whom, and end for which, he descended, they differ in, but as to a local descent into the infernal parts they all agree. Who were then in those parts they could not certainly define; but whosoever were there, that Christ by the presence of his soul was with them they all determined.

That this was the General opinion of the Church, will appear not onely

the Psalmist, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, *Τὴν ψυχήν μου οὐκ ἀφήσεις ἐν ᾆδῶν, ὅπου ἡ ψυχή κατέχοντο*. τὸ πῶς γὰρ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀποκαλύπτει τοῖς ἡγεμενομένοις ψυχῆς πρὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπολλινάριον, ὁ ὅς προσλαμβάνει τὸ σῶμα δι' ἡμετέρας ἀψυχῶν καὶ αἰώνων, ἀς ἀνάσσει; And from hence we may understand the words of Theodoret, who at the end of his exposition of this Psalm, thus concludes, *Οὕτως ὁ Σαλμὼς καὶ τὴν Ἀρείαν, καὶ τὴν Εὐνομίαν, καὶ Ἀπολλινάριον φρονεῖν ἀναγγελλεῖ*. Which is in reference to those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell. In the same manner Leporius Presbyter, quod male senserat de Incarnatione Christi corrigens, as Genadius observeth, and particularly disavowing that of the Arians and Apollinarians, Deum hominemque commixtum, & tali confusione carnis & Verbi quasi aliquod corpus effectum, does thus expresse the reality and distinction of the soul and body in the same Christ; Tam Christus filius Dei tunc mortuus jacuit in sepulchro, quam idem Christus filius Dei ad inferna descendit. Sicut beatus Apostolus dicit, *Quod autem ascendit quid est nisi quod descendit primum in inferiores partes terre?* Ipse utique Dominus & Deus noster Iesus Christus unicus Dei qui cum anima ad inferna descendit, ipse cum anima & corpore ascendit ad coelum, *Libel. Emendationis. Ant Capreolus Bishop of Carthage writing against the Nestorian Heresie, proveth that the soul of Christ was united to his Divinity when it descended into hell, and follows that Argument, urging it at large. In which discourse among the rest he bath this passage, Tantum abest, Deum Dei filium incommutabilem atque incomprehensibilem ab inferis potuisse concludi, ut nec ipsam assumptionis animam exitiabiliter susceptam aut tenaciter derelictam, sed nec carnem ejus credimus contagione alicujus corruptionis infectam. Ipsi namque vox est in Psalmo, sicut Petrus interpretatur Apostolus, Non derelinques animam meam apud inferos, neque sanctum tuum videre corruptionem, Epist. ad Hispanos. Lastly, the true Doctrine of the Incarnation against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the verity of the soul of Christ really present in Hell, and the verity of his body at the same time really present in the grave; as it is excellently delivered by Fulgentius, Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, & secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit, & secundum eandem animam ab inferno ad carnem, quam in sepulchro reliquerat, rediit: secundum divinitatem vero suam, quæ nec loco tenetur nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima; ac pro hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus, quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam susceperat separatus, qui & in anima sua fuit, ut solutus inferni doloribus ab inferno victrix rediret, & in carne sua fuit, ut celeri resurrectione corrumpi non posset. Ad Trasimund. lib. 3. cap. 34.*

thers for the conviction of this errour was, that Christ descended into Hell; which the Apollinarians could not deny, and that this descent was not made by his divinity or by his body, but by the motion and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answer'd by the Hereticks, as now it is by many, that his descent into Hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body onely, which descended to the grave; or that it was not a real but onely virtual descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of hell; or that his soul was not his intellectuall spirit or immortal soul, but his living soul which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this Article, the Apollinarians answer might have been sound, and the Catholicks Argument of no validity. But being those Hereticks did all acknowledge this Article; Being the Catholick Fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the soules below; it followeth that it was the general doctrine of the Church, that Christ did descend into hell, by a local motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the soules of men departed were.

Nor can it be reasonably objected that the Argument of the Fathers was of equal force against these Hereticks, if it be understood of the animal soul, as it would be if it were understood of the rational; as if those Hereticks had equally deprived Christ of the rational and animal soul. For it is most certain that they did not equally deprive Christ of both; but most of the

Αδελφὸν ἔστω καλῶν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄδης ἦν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὰς ἐκείτῃ ἄγίας καὶ σκεδὴν τίμα, τὸν Ἀβελὸν, τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, τὸν Ἰωὴλ, δὲ καὶ Σαμουὴλ ἐκάλιστο. *This doctrine was maintained by all those who believed that the soul of Samuel was raised by the witch of Endor: for though he were so great a Prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades, and not onely so, but under the power of Satan.* Thus Iustine Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, Φαίνομεν ὅτι καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχὰς τῶν δικαίων ἐπεσφοντο ὑπὸ ἰζουσίας ἐπὶ τὸν ἄδην τῶν δαιμονίων, ὅπως δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ μὲν ἐκείνῃ αὐτὸς πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐμολογεῖτο. *Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius Antiochenus, and others.*

both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God, the soules of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the people of God.

But others there were who thought *Hades* or *infernus* was never taken in † the Scriptures for any place of happiness, and therefore they did not conceive the souls of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did passe into any such infernal place; and consequently that the descent into hell was not his going to the Prophets or the Patriarchs which were not there. For as, if it had been onely said that Christ had gone unto the bosome of Abram, or to Paradise, no man would have ever believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is onely written, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the Patriarchs who were not there.

Now this being the diversity of opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose soules the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of *Hades* to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the soules of men (as well those which dyed in the favour of God as those which departed in their sinnes) * some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of *Hades*, where the souls of all the faithful, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, were detained, and there dissolving all the power by which they were detain'd below, translated them into a farre more glorious place, and estated them in a condition farre more happy in the heavens above.

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration

† S. Augustine began to doubt of that general reason ordinarily given of Christs Descent into Hell to bring the Patriarchs & Prophets thence, upon this ground, that he thought the word Infernus was never taken in the Scriptures with a good sense; Quamquam illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, Inferos appellatos ubi iustorum animæ acquiescunt, De Genesi ad litem.

nam, l. 12. c. 33. Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro: nec mihi occurrit Inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam duntaxat Canonicam. *Ibid.* Non facile alicubi Scripturam Inferorum nomen possum invenitur in bono, *Epist.* 57. Præsertim quia ne ipsos quidem Inferos usquam Scripturarum locis in bono appellatos potui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis auctoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abraham, id est secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars inferorum fuisse credenda est: quamquam in his ipsis tanti Magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse Abraham, *Inter vos & nos chaos magnum firmatum est*, satis, ut opinor, appareat non esse quandam partem & quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis sinum, *Epist.* 99. * *This is the Opinion generally received in the Schools, and delivered as the sense of the Church of God in all ages: but though it were not so general, as the Schoolmen would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it.* Οὐκ ἔστι σωτηρία ἥτις ἐν ἀδύ-ψυχῇ ἀνὴρ παρὲν ἐν μακρῶν αἰώνων τὴν ἀφ' ἧς αὐτὸς ἀνέστη. *Euseb.* de *Demonst. Evang.* l. 10. Κατὰ τὴν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια ἴτα κακῶς ἐν λυτρώσει τὰς δαίμονας. *Cyrl.* *Catech.* 4. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἡ θείας τιμῆς τὰ πάντα τὰ καὶ μυστήριον τοῦ πάθος, καὶ σωτῆρ τῇ ψυχῇ κατεπιδείναι τὰ καταχθόνια, ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον δὲ τὴν ἐκείνῃ πρὸς τὸν μακρὸν αἰῶνα σωτηρίαν, οὐκ ἔστι ἀλλὰ τὸν πατέρα. *Translatum erat Enoc, raptus Elias; sed non est servus supra Dominum. Nullus enim ascendit in Cælum, nisi qui descendit de coelo. Nam & Moyse, licet corpus ejus non apparuerit in terris, nusquam tamen in gloria cœlesti legimus, nisi postquam Dominus suæ resurrectionis pignore vincula solvit inferni, & priorum animas elevavit. S. Ambros.* l. 4. de *Fide ad Gratianum.* Qui in eo loco detinebantur sancti, vinculorum solutionem in Christi adventu sperabant. Nemo enim ab Inferni sedibus liberatur nisi per Christi gratiam. Eo igitur post mortem Christus descendit. Ut angelus in caminum Babylonis tres pueros liberandos descendit, ita Christus ad fornacem descendit Inferni, in quo clausæ iustorum animæ tenebantur. Postquam eo descendit, inferorum claustra perfodit, diripuit, vastavit, spoliavit, victas inde animas liberando, *S. Hieron.* in *Ecclesiasten.*

† *In fine Mar-
tyr in his Dia-
logue with
Trypho first
begins, Αὐτὸς
μὲν εἰς ἑστῶν
οὐκ ἐστὶν φησὶ πα-
σαι τὰς ψυχὰς
ἐν αἷσι ἀλλ' οὐδὲ
τοῖς κακοῖς ἀλ-
λὰ τὸ τὰς μὲν
βιωσάντων κρείτ-
τον πᾶσι χρόνῳ
μῖνον, τὰς δ'
ἀδικούντων ποτι-
σθῆναι ἐν χέρεσι,
τὸν τὸς κρείττους
ἐνδεχόμενον
χρεῖν τι.*
After him Ire-
naeus, l. 5. 26.

of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are † detained below still, and shall not enter into heaven untill the general resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come, should be kept out from heaven till he came; and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come, should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

But such as thought the place in which the souls of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called Hell, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper Hell, or place of torment, so the end of his Descent was to deliver souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that Hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of † Hereticks; but to believe that many were delivered, was both by them and many others counted Orthodox.

Cum Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abiit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, & post resurrectionem assumptus est, manifestum est quia & discipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, & ibi usque ad resurrectionem commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem; post recipientes corpore & perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corporaliter, quemadmodum & Dominus resurrexit, sic venient in conspectum Dei. Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum; perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo Magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum à Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus (quod & per Jonam manifestum est) post triduum resurgens assumptus est sic & nos sustinere debemus definitum à Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus prænuntiatum à Prophetis, & sic resurgentes assumi, quosque Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. *Tertullian followseth Irenæus in this particular, Habes & regionem Inferum subterraneam credere, & illes cubito pellere qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super Dominum & discipuli super magistrum, aspernati si forte in Abraham sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solatium carpere De Anima, c. 55. Nulli patet eorum terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi referabuntur regna cælorum, ibi. Eam itaque regionem sinum dico Abraham, etsi non cælestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus iustorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. Ado. Marci. l. 4. c. 34. Omnes ergo animæ peres Inferos? inquis. Velis & nolis, & supplicia jam illic & refrigeria habes, pauperem & divitem. Cur enim non putes animam & puniri & foveri in inferis, interim sub expectatione utriusque judicii in quadam usurpatione & candida ejus? De Anima, cap. 58. S. Hilary in his Commentary upon these words of the Psalm, Dominus custodiet & introitum tuum & exitum tuum ex hoc & usque in sæculum, Non enim temporis hujus & sæculi est ista custodia, non aduri sole atque luna, & ab omni malo conservari, sed futuri boni expectatio est, cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cælestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interim Abraham collocati; quo adire impios interjectum Chaos inhibet, quosque introcundi rursum in regnum cælorum tempus adveniat. Custodit ergo Dominus exitum, dum de corpore exeuntes seclerum ab impiis interjecto Chaos quiescunt. Custodit & introitum, dum nos in æternum illud & beatum regnum introducit. And at the end of the 2. Psalm, Judicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio est æterna vel poenæ: tempus vero n. ortis habet unumquemque suis legibus, dum ad judicium unumquemque aut Abraham reservat aut poenæ. Thus Gregory Nyssen still leaves the Patriarchs in Abrahams bosome, in expectation of admittance into heaven, καὶ γὰρ οἱ μετὰ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατριαρχαὶ μὴν ἰδὲν τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῶν ἐνδοσίων ἔχον, καὶ οὐκ ἀνίστανθαι οὐδέ τι τοιοῦτον ἀνατρεῖσθαι· καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁ Ἀβραὰμ· ἀλλὰ ὁ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῶν ἐν τῷ χαλεποῖ ἐστὶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁ πῦρ ἰσχυρῶν καὶ χαλεποῖ, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Παῦλον φησὶν, ἴτα μὴ, φησὶ, τοῖς ἰσχυρῶν τοιοῦτος.* De Hominis Opificio, cap. 22. These therefore which conceived that the souls of the Godly now after Christs ascension do goe unto the bosome of Abraham, where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the general Resurrection, did not believe that Christ did therefore descend into hell that he might translate the Patriarchs from thence into heaven.

† S. Augustine in his book de Hæresibus reckons this as the seventy ninth Heresie. Alia, descendente ad Inferos Christo credidisse incredulos & omnes inde existimat liberatos. And though he gives the Heresy without a name as he found it in Philastrius, yet we find the opinion was not very singular. For Eudodius propounded it to S. Augustine, as a question in which he desired satisfaction, an descendens Christus omnibus evangelizavit, omnesque à tenebris & poenis per gratiam liberavit, ut à tempore resurrectionis Domini judicium expectetur exinanitis inferis. And in his answer to that question, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an Heresie, but as a doubtful proposition. His resolution first is, that it did not concern the Prophets and the Patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in Hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence. Addunt quidam hoc beneficium antiquis etiam Sanctis fuisse concessum, Abel, Seth, Noe, & do-

The

end of the Gospel (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those onely which are in this life) and as incongruous to the state and condition of those souls to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all Saints before departed, 'tis certain they were never *disobedient in the dayes of Noah*, nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of Christ, who by vertue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptance had received a reward long before. If we look upon them which dyed in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preach'd. The rich man whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, least they also should come unto that place: but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if *the living, who hear'd not Moses and the Prophets, would not be perswaded though one rose from the dead*, surely those which had been disobedient unto the Prophets, should never be perswaded after they were dead. Luke 16. 31.

Whether therefore we consider the Authorities first introducing this opinion, which were Apocryphal; or the testimonies of Scripture, forc'd and improbable; or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the Gospel; or the persons to whom Christ should be thought to preach, which if dead in the faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction, if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation, this preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end of his descent into Hell.

Nor is this Preaching onely to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Christs Descent; but the effect it self pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the Ancients thought, as is shew'n before, that Christ did therefore descend into hell that he might deliver the soules of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of happinesse; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which 'tis built, nor in respect of the Action or Effect it self. The Authority upon which the strength of this doctrine doth rely, is that place of the Acts, *whom God hath raised up loosing the pains of hell*, for so they read it: from whence the Argument is thus deduced, God did loose the pains of hell, when Christ was raised: but those pains did not take hold of Christ himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death; and consequently he could not be loosed from, or taken out of those pains, in which he never was. In the same manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Saints of Old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called Hell, yet were they there in happinesse, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of hell. It followeth then, that those alone which dyed in their sins were involved in those pains, and when those pains were loosed then were they releas'd; and being they were loosed when Christ was raised, the consequence will be, that he descending into hell, delivered some of the damned soules from their torments there.

But

that dyeth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the lamb slain before the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into Hell, was not to deliver any damned soules, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joyes of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by vertue of his descent the soules of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before, and whether Christ descended into Hell to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later ages of the Church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; He delivered not the soules of the damned, † therefore he delivered the soules of them which believed, and of them alone. Till at last the Schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of * faith and infallible certainty, that the soul of Christ descending into hell did deliver from thence all the soules of the Saints which were in the bosome of Abraham, and did conferre upon them actuall and essentiall beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds; first, that the soules of Saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the Kingdom of heaven.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of Antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The † most ancient of all the Fathers, whose writings are extant, were so farre from believing that the end of Christs descent into hell was to translate the Saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christs death, untill the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shewen, thought the bosome of Abraham was not in any place, which could be termed Hell; and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into Hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that Christ delivered the Patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be sav'd as well as the Patriarchs

† So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released by Christs descent, thus inferres & concludes, *Hæc itaque omnia pertransantes, nihil aliud teneatis, nisi quod vera fides per Catholicam Ecclesiam docet; quia descendens ad Inferos Dominus illos solummodo ab inferni claustris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam in fide & bona operatione*

servavit, l. 6. Epist. 179. So Isidore Hispalensis by way of opposition, Ideo Dominus in inferno descendit ut his qui ab eo non pœualiter detinebantur, viam aperiret revertendi ad cœlos. So Venerable Bede upon the place of S. Peter. Catholica fides habet, quia descendens ad inferna Dominus non incredulos inde, sed fideles tantummodo suos educens ad cœlestia secum regna perduxerit; neque exutis corpore animabus & inferorum carcere inclusis, sed in hac vita vel per seipsum, vel per suorum exempla live verba fidelium quotidie viam vitæ demonstrat. * These are the words of Suarez in 3^{am} Thomæ Disputat. 43. Sect. 3. Primo ergo, certum est Christum descendendum ad Inferos animabus sanctis, quæ in sinu Abrahæ erant, essentiallem beatitudinem & cætera animæ dona, quæ illam consequuntur, contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo; quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem. Deinde est de fide certum, Christum per mortem aperuisse hominibus januam regni: ideoque de fide etiam certum est, animas Sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decedentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum. Ergo idem est de prædictis animabus. † We have shewed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient, producing the expresse testimonies of Iustine Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen. So also Novatian l. de Trinitate, Quæ infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis potestatibus vacua. Locus enim est quo piorum animæ impiorumque ducantur, futuri judicii præjudicia sentientes.

were,

* We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned soules were saved then; and S. Augustine had his adhuc requiro, when he wrote unto Euodius concerning that opinion. Beside, the doubt of that great Divine, Gregory Nazianzenus, is very observable, who in his Oration de Paschate hath these words, Ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν ἕλκοντος τοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν διπλῆς καταβύσσου; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πάντας ἐπιγαγεῖν, ἢ καὶ τοὺς πεισθέντας; Where his question is clearly this, whether Christ appearing in hell, did save all without exception, or did save there, as he does here, onely such as believed. To this it is answered by Suarez two wayes, that it is the ordinary and universal law, that none of the damned should be saved, An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate & arbitrio aliquem damnatum ex Gehenna Christus eduxerit, dubitari quoquo modo potest. . . . Et juxta hæc possent intelligi Nazianzenus & Augustinus. But this will by no means solve their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some onely: which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence with another answer, Quoniam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut proponeret quid de hoc mysterio inquirere ac scire oporteat. Which is as much as to say, that He was satisfied of the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas 'tis clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have before shewn, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undetermined. And as for the other, Augustinus recte potest intelligi de animabus Purgatorii, it is certainly false, unless they will enlarge that Purgatory as wide as Hell; for the question was of emptying that.

were, and * doubted whether all were not so sav'd or no. Indeed I think there were very few (if any) for above 500 years after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the Saints out of Hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the Ancients believed not that they were remov'd at all, and so few acknowledged that they were remov'd alone.

And if the Authority of this opinion in respect of it's antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be lesse. For first, if it be not certain that the soules of the Patriarchs were in some place called hell after their own death, and untill the death of Christ; if the bosome of Abraham were not some infernal mansion; then can it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the soules of the just, the Patriarchs and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called Hell: the bosome of Abraham might well be in the heavens above, farre from any region where the Devil and his Angells were; the Scriptures no where tell us that the spirits of just men went unto, or did remain in hell; the place in which the Rich man was in torments after death is called Hell, but that into which the Angells carried the poor mans soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two; nor is it likely that the Angells which see the face of God should be sent down from heaven to convey the soules of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated Enoch, and Elias was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that Moses was with Elias as well before as upon the Mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that Abraham should be in any worse place or condition then Enoch was, having as great a testimony that he pleased God, as Enoch had.

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the Soul of Christ delivered the Soules of the Saints of old from Hell, and imparted to them the beatificall vision, except it were certain that the soules are in another place and a better condition now then they were before. But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place & a better condition then they were before our blessed Saviour dyed; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happinesse and glory already past. * Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; there then did the Gentiles which came in to Christ find the Patriarchs,

even

even in the Kingdome of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else then Lazarus did. For the description is the same, *There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets in the Kingdome of God, and you your selves thrust out.* For as the Rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and seeth Abraham as farre off, before the death of Christ; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the Prophets, when the Gentiles were brought in. Inke 13. 28.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the soules of the Saints had been in a place called Hell, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition then they were before Christs death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ descended into Hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his Resurrection, it might not be effected till his Ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might have no dependance on his descension. I conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that Proposition which the Schoolmen take for a matter of faith, That Christ delivered the soules of the Saints from that place of Hell which they call *Limbus of the Fathers*, into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into Hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerfull and effectual for the Redemption of the Saints before him, as for those which follow him; being *they did all eat the same spirituall meat, and did all drink the same spirituall drink;* being Abraham is the Father of us all, and we now after Christs Ascension are called but to *walk in the steps of the faith* of that Father; being the bosome of Abraham is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed Angels before the death of Christ convey'd the souls of those which departed in the favour of God, and is also † promised to them which should believe in Christ after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosome of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still * to us that we shall goe to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christs descent into hell, to convey the soules of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those which were with 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Rom. 4. 12, 16.

† Although the Bosome of Abraham in expresse and formal terms be spoken onely of Lazarus, whom Christ being

yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same Bosome is virtually and in termes equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joyes of the life to come are likened to a Feast, in which, according to the custome then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other. who is therefore said to lye in his bosome, as we read of S. Iohn, *ὁ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ ἑτέρου*: thus in that heavenly Feast in the Kingdome of God, Lazarus is *ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἀβραάμ.* And in the same Chap. Christ saith, that Many shall come from the East and from the West, *καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ,* discumbent cum Abrahamo, sit down with Abraham, as we translate it after our custome, at the same feast, that is, *ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Ἀβραάμ,* &c. as Euthymius, Quia Deus Abraham, coeli conditor, Pater Christi est; idcirco in regno coelorum est & Abraham, cum quo accubituræ sunt nationes quæ crediderunt in Christum filium creatoris.

* S. Augustine often shewes the comfort which he had in going to the bosome of Abraham: As in the case of his friend Nebridius, Nunc ille vivit in sinu Abraham. Quicquid illud est quod illo significatur sinu, ibi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animæ locus? Confess. l. 9. cap. 3. And he seates that place (as uncertain as before) where it was before. Post vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt Sancti, quibus dicetur, Venite benedicti Patri, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est ab initio mundi. Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam poteris ibi esse ubi illi in quondam ulcerosum pauperem dives ille superbus & sterilis in mediis suis tormentis vidit à longe requiescentem. Concio 1. in Psal. 36. And this he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seates that place in conspectu Domini, de Civit. Dei l. 1. c. 12. and looked upon them which ere in it, as upon those, à quibus Christus secundum beatitudinem præsentiam nunquam recessit, Epist. 99.

M m

them,

them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.*

Col. 2. 15.

Eph. 4. 8, 9.
B. Bilson
p. 294.
Col. 2. 12, 13,
14, 15.

Eph. 4. 8, 9.

Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour *descended into Hell*, was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of Fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two, *Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them: And, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.* Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth. By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christs descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were buried with Christ in baptism, with whom ye were also raised; and when ye were dead in sinnes, he quickned you together with him, forgiving your sinnes, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself. That is, say they, ye dyed and were buried with Christ, who fastned the hand-writing of ordinances to the Crosse, that he might abolish it, from having any right to tye or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickned, and raised together with Christ, who spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, *spoiling principalities and powers*, are not referred to the Crosse, but to Christs resurrection. This Triumph over Satan and all his Kingdome, the same Apostle to the Ephesians setteth down as a consequent to Christs death, and pertinent to his resurrection, *Ascending on high he led captivity captive*: and this, *He ascended, what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* so that ascending from the lower parts of the earth he led captivity captive, which is all one with he triumphed over power and principalities. With this coherence and conjunction of the Apostles words, together with the interpretation of the ancient Fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated, that Christ after his death, and before his Resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, ev'n in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

But notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this Triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in it self, or how it can have any consistency with the denial of those other ends, which they who of late have embraced this opinion, do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the Scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the Fathers, who believe not that any of the soules of the damned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the soules of the Saints of old were removed from thence by Christs Descent; which were the reasons why the Fathers spake of such a triumphing in hell, and leading captivity captive there.

That the triumphing in the Epistle to the Colossians is not referred to the Crosse but to the Resurrection, cannot be prov'd; the coherence cannot inforce so much; no Logick can inferre such a division, that the blotting out of the hand-writing belongeth precisely to our

our burial with him, and the triumphing over principalities and powers particularly to our being quickned together with him; or that the blotting out was performed at one time, and the triumphing at another. Our present Translation attributeth it expressly to the Crosse, rendering the last words, *triumphing over them in it*, that is, in the Crosse, mentioned in the former verse; and though † anciently it have been read, *triumphing over them in himself*, yet still there are these two great advantages on our side; first, that if we read, *in it*, it proves the triumph spoken of in this place perform'd upon the Crosse; and if we read, *in himself*, it proveth not that the triumph was performed in any other place, because he was *himself* upon the Crosse. Secondly, the Ancient Fathers of the Greek Church read it as we do, *in it*, and interpret the triumph of his death, and those others of the Latine Church, which did read it otherwise, did also acknowledge with the Greeks the Crosse not onely to be the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained, but also to be the trophie of that victory, † and the triumphal chariot.

This place then of S. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ descended into Hell, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpose of itself, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For first we have already shew'n, that the descending into the lower parts of the earth, doth not necessarily signifie his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted, that those words did signifie Hell, and this Article

† So the Vulgar Latine, Palam triumphans illos in semetipso; as also the Syriack,

So Novatianus de Trin. triumphans illis in semetipso.

S. Hilary, triumphans ees in semetipso.

So Ambrose, Augustine, and Pacianus.

* Oecumenius sheweth their reading, Θεριαμβολῶν αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ, and

Interpretation, Θεριαμβολῶν λίαν ἡ καὶ ἡ πῶς τῶν αὐτῶν αὐτῶν καὶ πανήγυρις. Ἐθριαμβολῶν αὐτὸν διὰ τὴν

στυγὴν, τυτίστην, δαίμονες, καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν θριαμβῶν ὑπὸ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Ἐν αὐτῷ then is διὰ τὴν στυγὴν, and this θριαμβῶν κατὰ τὴν στυγὴν will no way agree with that actual triumph in hell. But Theophylact yet more clearly, Θεριαμβολῶν αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ, τυτίστην, ἐν τῷ στυγερῷ τῶν δαίμονων ὑπὸ τῆς δόξης. Θριαμβῶν γὰρ λίαν ὅταν περὶ τοῦ θύματος παραμύλιον ἱερουργῶν θυμολογία πομπῶν παρ' αὐτῶν, τὴν ὑπὸ δόξης δαίμονας παρὶς δεικνύων. Ἐν τῷ στυγερῷ αὐτὸν τὸν τῶν πατρῶν σπῆρας ὁ Κρίτης, ὁ παρὰ τὴν δημοσίαν διατρεφόμενος Ἑβραῖος, Ῥωμαῖον, Ἰουδαῖον, τὸς δαίμονας ἱθὺς θριαμβῶν. And this Exposition they received from S. Chrysostome, who makes the θριαμβῶν on the Crosse, to consist in the death upon it, Ἐκὼς τὴν πᾶν ἡλῶν διὰ τὴν δόξαν, ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὴν καίαν λαλῶν. Where it is to be observed that the triumph is not attributed to the soul departed from the body and descended into hell, but rather to the body left by the soul and hanging on the Crosse, διὰ τὴν οὐκ εἰς σῶμα, πᾶν ἡμῶν τὴν καὶ αὐτῶν θριαμβῶν, νίκης, says Theodore. And before all these Origen most expressly, Visibiliter quidem Filius Dei in carne crucifixus est, invisibiliter vero in ea cruce diabolus cum principatibus suis & potestatibus affixus est cruci. Non tibi hoc videbitur verum, si tibi horum testem produxero Apostolum Paulum? Quod erat contrarium nobis, tulit illud de medio affigens cruci sue, exuens principatus & potestates traduxit libere, triumphans eas in ligno crucis. Ergo duplex Dominice crucis est ratio; una illa, qua dicit Petrus quod Christus crucifixus nobis reliquit exemplum; & hæc secunda, qua crux illa trophæum Diaboli fuit, in quo & crucifixus est & triumphatus, in Iosiam. Requievit ut Leo, cum in cruce positus principatus & potestates exiit, & triumphavit eos cum ligno crucis. Idem. † Tertull. Serpentis spoliū, devictō Principe mundi, Affixit ligno refugarum immane trophæum. Prudentius. Dic trophæum passionis, Dic triumphalem crucem, Cūkem. Hymn. 10. S. Hilary most expressly, Manus ejus edocta ad bellum sunt cum vicit sæculum. Ego enim, ait, vici mundum, cum extensus in crucem invictissimis armis ipsius passionis instruitur. Et posuisti, inquit, ut arcum arcum brachia mea, cum de omnibus virtutibus ac potestatibus in ipso trophæo gloriosæ crucis triumphat, & principatus & potestates traduxit cum fiducia triumphans in semetipso, in Psalm 143. Where it is observable that the Father does read it in semetipso, and interprets it in cruce. Nos quoniam trophæum jam videmus, & quod curram suum triumphator ascendit, consideremus quod non arborum, non quadrijugis plaustrum manubias de mortali hoste quæsitæ, sed patibulo triumphali captiva de sæculo spolia suspendit, S. Amb. l. 10. in cap. 23. S. Lucæ and amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards, captivum principem mundi, & spiritalia nequitie quæ sunt in celestibus. To this alludes Fulgentius l. 3. ad Thrasim. Sic oportuit peccatorum nostrorum chirographum deleri, ut dum vetus homo noster simul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo triumphatoris victoria panderetur. Whether therefore we read it ἐν αὐτῷ with the Greeks, that is ἐν στυγερῷ, or ἐν αὐτῷ with the Latines in seipso, it is the same; for he triumphed over the Devil by himself upon the Crosse, as in the same case it is written Eph. 2. 16. καὶ συνεπαυλώθη τὸς ἀποστόλους ἐν τῷ σῶματι τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τὴν στυγὴν, δεσπολεύσας τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν αὐτῷ.

of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that Scripture, that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be only this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive, descended first into Hell. In that he ascended (and ascending led captivity captive) what is it but that he descended first? the Descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person, and that is all which the Apostles words will evince. Nay further yet, the Ascent mentioned by S. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the Descent into Hell, for it evidently signifieth the ascension which followed forty dayes after his Resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an ascending up on high, even farre above all heavens. Now the leading captivity captive belongeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said, that he descended first to lead captivity captive; and yet it must be so, if Christ descended into hell to triumph there; it is not said, when he had led captivity captive, he ascended up on high; for then it might be supposed that the captives had been led before: but it is expressly said, ascending up on high he led captivity captive; and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be prov'd then this, that Christ triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the Crosse, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven. Which is so farre from proving that Christ descended into hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to perswade the contrary. For why should he goe to hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the crosse? why should he goe to captive that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into heaven?

† The Original words doe manifestly shew that this triumphant act did not precede this ascent.

For had it been *αὐχμαλιώσας αὐχμαλιώσας* we might well have expounded it thus, Christ did lead sin and death and Satan captive; & when he had done so, ascended up on high: but being it is written *ἀναστὰς εἰς ὕψος*, that is, having ascended up on

high, *ἔχμαλίσεν αὐχμαλιώσας*, he captivated a captivity, the Ascent must here precede the captivation, though not in time (as it did the giving of gifts) yet in nature: so that it is not proper to say, by captivating he ascended; but it is proper to expresse it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity. * So S. Hierome on that place of the Ephesians, Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut Sanctorum animas quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cœlos victor abduceret. And on Mat. 12. 29. Alligatus est fortis, & religatus in Tartarum, & Domini contritus pedes; & direptis sedibus Tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas. So Arnouldus Carnotensis is to be understood, De Visione Chriftianis, Passus est rex illudi, & vira occidi, descendensque ad inferos, captivam ab antiquo captivitatem reduxit; Applying it to the custome of the Church, Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliati peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur, Ibid. Thus Athanasius when he speaks of Christs triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions *τὸ πᾶν αὐχμαλιώσας*, hell spoiled, to wit, of those souls which before it kept in hold. Otherwise in the same Oration in Passionem & crucem, he acknowledgeth the Triumph on the Crosse, *Ἐδυνασάμενος τὸ θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἑλπίδα* (not *ἐμαρτύρησεν*) *τὸ πᾶν αὐχμαλιώσας*, καὶ τοὺς αὐχμαλιώσας ἐλευθέρων καὶ ζωνταῖς. Thus Leo the Emperour, *Χρὶς ἀνέστη καὶ τὸ πᾶν αὐχμαλιώσας*, καὶ τοὺς αὐχμαλιώσας ἐλευθέρων καὶ ζωνταῖς. Hom. de Resur. And thus Macarius supposeth Christ victoriously speaking unto hell and death, *Καθ' ὅσον οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἑλπίδα*. Author libelli de Paschate, under the name of S. Ambrose, Expers peccati Christus cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, feras inferni januasque confringens, vincitas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, è diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam. Atque ita divinum triumphum æternis caracteribus est conscriptum, dum dicit, Ubi est, Mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, Mors, victoria tua?

tan,

cap. 4. *And the Commentaries under the same name*, Gratia Dei abundavit in descensu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho sublati eis in cœlum, ad Rom. 5. 14. Secundum animam descendit ad inferna & spoliavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum, Ebert. *Serm. 9. contra Catharos*. Thus still the Fathers which speak of spoiling hell, of leading captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be understood in respect to those souls which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession, or dominion of Satan, whether just or unjust.

tan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the soul of Christ descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil Hell, and lead captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no souls from thence, he had not spoiled hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the Fathers sense. Wherefore, being the Scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in hell; being the Triumph which the Fathers mention, was either in relation to the damned souls which Christ took out of those tormenting flames, as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infernal habitations, as others did conceive; being we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the effect of Christ's Descent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this, as the proper end of the Article.

Nor can we see how the Prophet David could intend so much, as if when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, he should have intended this, Thou shalt not leave my soul separated from my body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers of hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the prisoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In summe, those words of the Prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of it self free the body from corruption; so the hope that his soul should not be left in hell, supposeth it not to be in such a state as was of it self contradictory to dereliction.

And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the Prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shewn the substance of the Article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, did truly passe unto the places below where the souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so, was, that he might undergoe the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinful flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the souls of other persons use to be. All, which was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the Crosse; and all, which was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected upon and after his Resurrection: in the interim therefore there is nothing left, at least known

^a *Irenæus* so calls his descent, legem mortuorum servare. l. 5. 26. and *S. Hilary* expresses that which I intend, very clearly, *Morte non intercep- tus est unigenitus Dei filius; ad ex- plendam qui- dem hominis naturā, etiam morti se, id est, discessioni se tanquam ani- mæ corpo- risque subje- cit, & ad in- fernas sedes, id quod ho- mini debitum videtur esse, penetravit, Enar. in Psalm. 51. And be- fore him Ter-*

to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This he undertook to do, and did: and though the Ancient Fathers by the several additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their * writings, and is certainly most conformable to that prophetic expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explication, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption.*

Secondly, by the Descent of Christ into hell all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither; he went unto those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our fears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan hath taken up possession, and exerciseth his dominion; that having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. *a Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil,* and by his actual descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) † in the writings of the Fathers. Having thus examined the several Interpretations of this part of the Article, we may now give a brief and safe account thereof, and teach every one how they may expresse their faith without any danger of mistake, saying, I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the Crosse, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not and

tullian, *Christus Deus, quia & homo mortuus secundum Scripturas, & sepultus secus eadem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, De Anima cap. 55.* *Ἦλθεν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν σὺν τῷ, καὶ τοῖς ἡμῶν χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν πτωχῶς εἰς τὴν ἑλῆν, ἀλλ' ἡμῶν, ὑπερῷον ἀποκατεβὼν αὐτῷ ὑποκάτω στήθεος. Καταβῆναι μὲν τὸν θάνατον εἰς τὸν ἄδω· ἀνδρὶ ἄλλο καὶ τῷ τοῦ, ὃ ἐπελάθεν ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτὸν, ὁ Γελάσιος Ἀθ. Concil. Nice. l. 2. c. 32. This *S. Austin* calls proprietatem carnis, *Contra Felicium* c. 11. Scio ad inferos Divinitatem Filii Dei descendisse proprietate carnis, scio ad cælum ascendisse carnem merito deitatis. *And afterwards he calls it injuriam carnis, Erat uno atque eodem tempore ipse totus etiam in inferno, totus in cælo; illic patiens injuriam carnis, non relinquens gloriam deitatis, cap. 14. Impleta est Scriptura quæ dicit, Et cum iniquis reputatus est. Quod & altius intelligi potest, dicente de semetipso Domino, Reputatus sum cum descendentibus in lacum; factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber. Vere enim reputatus est inter peccatores & iniquos ut descenderet ad infernum, S. Hieron. in Isaia cap. 53. ver. 12. Rufinus in his Exposition of the Creed, descending upon that place of the Psalms, factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber; Non dixit homo, sed sicut homo. Sicut homo enim erat quia etiam descenderat in infernum; sed inter mortuos liber erat, quia à morte teneri non poterat. Et ideo in uno natura humanæ fragilitatis, in alio divinæ potestatis majestatis ostenditur. And yet more pertinently *Fulgentius*, Restabat ad plenum nostræ redemptionis effectum ut illuc usque homo sine peccato à Deo susceptus descenderet, quousque homo separatus à Deo peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri. & ad sepulchrum ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi, *Ad Trasm. cap. 30. Εἰς αὐτὸ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑλθὼν, καὶ ἐπελάθεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ, καὶ διὰ τὸν, καὶ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν σκότης, καὶ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἀπάντων, θανάτου γέροντες, καὶ τὸν εἰς ἄδω καταβῆναι ἐπὶ τὸν ἄδω, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα ἡμῶν ὁμοιωθῆναι ὅτις ἀμαρτίας, &c. Andreas Crei. Serm. in vitam humanam. I conclude this with that Exposition of *S. Hilary* upon those words of the Psalmist, If I goe down into hell thou art there also; Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut conspultis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendant; Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit, *Psalm. 138.* *a* Heb. 2. 14. † *As we read of the opinion in Tertullian's time, though not of him; Sed in hoc, in- quunt, Christus inferos adiit ne nos adiremus. Cæterum quod discrimen Ethnicorum & Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem? De Anima cap. 55. Aut ipsius vox est hic, Et eruiſti animam meam ab inferno inferiori, aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo ille pervenit usque ad infernum, ne nos remaneremus in inferno, S. August. in Psalm. 85. Πάστορ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέλαβε, καὶ περὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔθηκε, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄδω καταβῆναι, ἡμᾶς ἀνέφερε, *Athan. in Omnia mihi trad. &c.*****

though

though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as dye, and being he dyed in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who dye for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not his holy one to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his Angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ *Descended into Hell*.

HE ROSE AGAIN.

VWhosoever variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or † diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essential to the Christian faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three Particulars: First, the Action it self, or the Resurrection of Christ, *he rose again*. Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that Resurrection, *he rose from the dead*. Thirdly, the Circumstance of Time, or distance of his Resurrection from his Death, *rose from the dead the third day*.

For the illustration of the first Particular, and the justification of our belief in Christ's Resurrection, it will be necessary first to shew the promised Messias was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and onely Messias, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the Messias was to be the son of David, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which David suffer'd both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the Messias in those words, *The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, that is, his Christ*. From whence it came to passe, that *against the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to doe whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done*, which was to crucifie and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of David, and foretold of the son of David, *Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*. As therefore the persecution in respect of David amounted onely to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a setting in the kingdom; so being the conspiracy against the Messias amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner

† For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the last word à mortuis, and some copies in Rufinus have it not; yet is it generally expressed in all the rest which are more ancient then Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the Author or the Scribe, then to the usage of the Church in their age. Quod die tertio resurrexit à mortuis Dominus Christus nullus ambigit Christianus, S. Aug. Serm. in Vigiliis Pasche. a Psal. 2. 2. b Act. 4. 27. 28. c Psal. 2. 6, 7.

Abraham not perform'd, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfill'd. And thus the Resurrection of the Messias was represented by types, and foretold by prophecies; and therefore the Christ was to rise from the dead.

That Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us and confirmed by testimonies humane, angelical, and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, *held him by the feet and worship'd him*, and as the first preachers of his Resurrection, *with fear and great joy ran to bring his disciples word*. The blessed Apostles follow them, *to whom also he shew'd himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs*; who *with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus*, the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, grounded upon this necessity. *Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection*. The rest of the Disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, *even to five hundred brethren at once*. These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worship'd him, such as believed in him. And because the Testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not onely his disciples but even his enemies to confirm it. Those souldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an Angel like lightning and his rayment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive: even some of these came into the city and shewed unto the chief Priests all the things that were done. Thus was the Resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest humane testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

Acts 1.3.

4.33.

1.21, 22.

1 Cor. 15.6.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony then that of man: and therefore an Angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, *and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it*. Nay two Angells in white, *sitting the one at the head, the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain*, said unto the women, *Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but is risen*. These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the Angelical testimony of the Resurrection.

John 20. 12.

And if we receive the witness of men, or Angells, the witness of God is greater, who did sufficiently attest this Resurrection; not onely because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, *the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me*; adding these words to his Apostles, *and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning*. The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were inlightened, comforted, confirm'd, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, and

1 John 5.9.

shewed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And thus, as it was foretold of the Messias, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our enquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christs Resurrection, expressed in that terme *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection, and secondly to shew how those proprieties doe belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper Notion of the Resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or Angel, and make the same man or Angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and total production. This change is called a substantiall change to distinguish it from all accidentall alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep, ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sicknesse to health, but neither of these is a Resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible, cannot be said to rise again: resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be; and therefore if they should be reproduced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but onely a restitution of the *species* by another individual. But when a rational soul is separated from it's body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which liv'd before; and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper Resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For first, by a true, though miraculous, generation he was made flesh; and lived in his humane nature a true and proper life; producing vital actions as we doe. Secondly, he suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death; his soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, the same soule was reunited to the same body, and so he liv'd again the same man. For the truth of which, two things were necessary to be shewn upon his appearing after death, the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity of his body. All the Apostles doubted of the first, for when Christ stood in the midst of them, *they were affrighted, and supposed that they had seen*

seen a spirit. But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, † *Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.* He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self;* especially unbelieving Thomas, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithlesse, but believing.* The body then in which he rose, must be the same in which he liv'd before, because it was the same with which he dyed.

And that we might be assured of the soul as well as of the body, first he gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, *Have ye here any meat?* and they gave him a piece of a broyled fish and of an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing with them, shewing himself, seeing and hearing them: thirdly, he gave evidence of his rational and intellectual soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake unto them while he was yet with them. Thus did he shew, that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with an humane soul. And that they might be yet further assured that it was the same soul by which that body liv'd before, he gave a full testimony of his divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his disciples. For being no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven, being the divinity was never so united to any humane soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he liv'd and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he dyed, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that he rose from the dead by a true and proper Resurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christs Resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be Christ himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly † deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drunk of the brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the Crosse, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his Resurrection. Now being Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the Resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body, with which he liv'd united, and dyed separated.

Luke 39.

[illegible]

* Ideo clausis
ad discipulos

offiti introibat, & flatu suo dabat Spiritum Sanctum, & dato intelligentiæ lumine sanctorum Scripturarum occulta pandebat; & rursus idem vultus lateris, fixuras clavorum, & omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat; ut agnosceretur in eo proprietates divinæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere, *Leo Serm. 1. De Resurrectione.* † Ut mediator Dei & hominum homo Christus Iesus

resurrectione clarit
tus non fuisset.
Tract. 104. in Ioh.

disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus had said. Now if upon the Resurrection of Christ the Apostles believed those words of Christ, *Destroy this temple and I will raise it up*, then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised Christ, and no other person mentioned but himself.

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this Argument, † saying that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy rais'd himself from the bed, or as we shall raise our selves out of the graves when the trumpet should sound: and this was all which Christ could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up*. For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and rais'd it out of the grave, and have shewn it alive. This answer therefore is a meer shift: for to raise a body which is dead is in the language of the Scriptures to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortal body. *b* For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will*. He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, & being so to be raised again; therefore the resurrection must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christ's body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved then by that separation. God suffered not his holy one to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of

† Aliter Deus Christum suscitavit, aliter Christus corpus suum: Deus Christo vitam restituendo, Christus vitam recuperata corpus suum levando, & ex sepulchro prodeundo, seque post mortem vivum sistendo præbendoq. Sic & Paralyticus ille exerebat corpus suum, accepta à Christo sanitate: sic & omnes mortui surgent, & ex monu-

mentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Christo vita, Confessionis Sociniana Vindices. a John 2. 19. b John 5. 21. * *Ἐγείρεται ὁ νεκρὸς καὶ ζωνοποιεῖ* is the same thing; and therefore one in the apodosis answereth to both in the protasis, and sheweth that Christ raiseth and quickeneth whom he will, which demonstrateth his infinite and absolute power. Καὶ τοι τοῦ θανάτου ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ποιεῖται, τὸ ὅτι δὲ δίδωκε, ζωὴν τοῖς ἴσθι. Εἰ γὰρ δὲ δίδωκε, δυνάμει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ποιεῖται. τὸ γὰρ δίδωκε ἰσχυρὰς ἐστὶν ἡ δὲ δυνάμει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκείνη δὲ δίδωκε. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ, ὡς πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ἰσχυρὰς δίδωκε, τὸ δὲ δυνάμει τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐκείνη δὲ δίδωκε, τὸ δὲ δυνάμει τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐκείνη δὲ δίδωκε, τὸ δὲ δυνάμει τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐκείνη δὲ δίδωκε. S. Chrys. Hom. 38. in Joh. Where it is very observable that though ἰσχυρὰς δίδωκε and ζωνοποιεῖ be the same in the language of the Scriptures, yet ἰσχυρὰς δίδωκε and ζωνοποιεῖ are not the same. By which observation the now Learned Bishop of Ely hath most evidently detected that Socinian cavil. Si quis obstinate vocem Excitabo [ἰσχυρὰ] urgere vult, is animadvertet quid D. Jesus sibi dicat. Eum qui perdidit animam, vivificaturum eam. Ubi si quis insistere veller ipsi verbis, eum colligere oporteret, Credentes etiam ipsos sese vivificaturos, & a mortuis excitaturos. Catech. Racov. p. 278. For ἰσχυρὰ hath manifest relation to the dead, but ζωνοποιεῖ unto the living. And therefore our Translation hath very well rendred those words Luc. 17. 33. *ὁ σώων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*. Whosoever shall loose his life shall preserve it, so that ζωνοποιεῖν ψυχῇ is to preserve life, which interpretation is most evident out of the antithesis of the same place. *Ὁ σώων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσει, ἀπολλύων αὐτὴν ἀπολλύει*. For σώων, and ἀπολλύων in the former part are the same with σώων and ζωνοποιεῖ in the latter. And beside this is the language of S. Luke, who Acts 7. 19. says that the Egyptians ill entreated the Israelites, τὸ τοῖς ἰσχυροῦς τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, ὅτι τὸ μὴ ζωνοποιεῖν αὐτούς. So that they call out their young children to the end they might not live, that is, remain alive. Συρ. נפשו לא תהיה. ne servarentur, ne viverent, as the Arabic. In which words there is a manifest reference to that place in Exodus, where thrice this word is used in that sense by the LXX. as 1. 17. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם, V. T. sed conservabant maves. Chald. *וַחֲחִין בְּנֵי*, so vers. 18. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, and 22. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, ζωνοποιεῖν αὐτούς. And indeed חֲחִין in Piel, is often used for keeping or preserving alive, and is so several times translated, ζωνοποιεῖν as well as ζωνοποιεῖ, as Iud. 8. 19. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, V. T. Si servaveris eos, non vos occiderem. If ye had saved them alive, I would not slay you. 1 Sam. 27. 9. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, V. T. Nec relinquebat viventem virum & mulierem. And left neither man nor woman alive. And which is yet nearer to our purpose, 1 King. 20. 31. *וַחֲחִין אֶת הַלְוִיִּם*, LXX. *ὁ σώων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσει*, V. T. forsitan salvabit animas nostras. Peradventure he will save thy life. So that ζωνοποιεῖν in the language of the LXX is to save alive, and ζωνοποιεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν, is to preserve ones life. So that S. Luke in the Text cited by the Socinians, could intend no more then, that he which was ready to loose his life for Christ should thereby preserve it, and consequently he speaks nothing of the raising of the dead.

cach

each to other; suffered no dissolution. Thus as the Apostle *desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ*, so the temple of Christs body was dissolved here, by the separation of his soul: for the temple standing was the body living; and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickning of the body. If the body of Christ had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre, when it was before quickned, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would doe, and the Apostles believ'd he did.

a John 10. 17,
18.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power onely to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himself to reunite his soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of himself, *a I lay down my life (or soul) that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* The laying down of Christs life was to dye, and the taking of it again was to revive: and by this taking of his life again he shewed himself to be the *Resurrection and the life*. For he which was *made of the seed of David according to the flesh, was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.* But if Christ had done no more in the resurrection, then lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth therefore, that Christ by that power which he had within himself did take his life again which he had laid down, did reunite his soul unto his body from which he separated it when he gave up the Ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself: and so it is a certain truth, † not onely that God the Father rais'd the Son, but also that God the Son rais'd himself.

† Καὶ αὐτὸς ἑ-
παθεν, καὶ τὸ
αὐτὸς ἀνίστηναι
ἑαυτὸν. Ign. ad
Smyrn.

Si peccati confessor revixit à morte, quis eum suscitavit? Nullus mortuus est suipius suscitator. Ille se potuit suscitare qui mortua carne non mortuus est. Etenim hoc suscitavit quod mortuum fuerat. Ille se suscitavit qui vivebat in se, in carne autem suscitanda mortuus erat. Non enim Pater solus Filium suscitavit, de quo dictum est ab Apostolo,

Propter quod eum Deus exaltavit, sed etiam Dominus seipsum, id est, corpus suum; unde dicit, Solvite templum hoc, & in trieno suscitabo illud. S. Aug. De Verbis Domini, Serm. 8.

From this consideration of the efficient cause of Christs Resurrection we are yet further assured, that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead in the same soul, and the same body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversie that he raised his own Son: and as while he was here alive, God spake from heaven saying, *This is my well beloved Son*; so after his death it was the same person, of whom he spake by the Prophet, *Thou art my son this day have I begotten thee*. If we look upon Christ himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly rise in soul and body by that Divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the soul. And thus we have sufficiently prov'd our second particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of Christs Resurrection, contained in those words, *He rose from the dead*.

The third Particular concerns the time of Christs Resurrection, which is expres'd by *the third day*; and those words afford a double consideration: one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three dayes; the other in respect of the day, which was the third day from his passion, and the precise day upon which he arose. For the first of these, we shall shew that the Messias, who was foretold both to dye and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that, in correspondence to these predictions, our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not rise from the dead untill, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

The

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations, one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day it self. The first is that of the Prophet Jonas, who *was in the belly of the great fish three dayes and three nights*, and then by the special command of God he was rendred safe upon the dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to the great city of Ninive. This was an expresse type of the Messias then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations; that *as Jonas was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*: and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the Messias after three dayes be taken out of the jaws of death, and restored unto the land of the living.

Jon. I. 17. and
2. 10.

Matth. 12. 38.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by Moses, *When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you, on the morrow after the sabbath the Priest shall wave it, and ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord.* For under the Levitical law all the fruits of the earth in the land of Canaan were prophane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated, and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the Priest, who lifted it up as 'twere in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them, so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptation of that. *For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy.* And this was alwayes done the day after the sabbath, that is, the Paschal solemnity, after which the fulnesse of the harvest followed: by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the Priest to God, so the promised Messias, that immaculate lambe which was to dye, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the Resurrection of the Messias after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

Lev. 23. 10.

Rom. 11. 16.

And now in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already prov'd to be the true Messias, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise *the third day*; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that Sabbath mentioned in the law.

As for the distance between the Resurrection and the death of Christ, it is to be considered first generally in it self, as it is some space of time; secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three dayes. Christ did not, would not, suddenly rise, least any should doubt that he ever dyed. It was as necessary for us that he should dye, as that he should live, and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did sometime continue it. † He might have descended from the Crosse before he dyed, but he would not, because he had undertaken to dye for us.

† De cruce
descendere
poterat, sed
Ioh. Traß. 22.

differebat ut de sepulchro resurgeret, S. Augustine in
* He

another, and consequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and of his resurrection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child eight dayes old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete dayes, between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty dayes was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is, Whitunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easterday, the day of the resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty dayes. Christ then who rose upon the first day of the week (as is confessed by all) dyed upon the sixth day of the week before: or if he had dyed upon the fifth he had risen not upon the third but the fourth day as † Lazarus did. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on the third day, being according to the constant language of the Greeks and Hebrews; he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day, who dyed upon any other day between which and the day of his resurrection there interven'd any more then one day: therefore those other forms of speech which are farre lesse frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of the third day so often reiterated.

When therefore we read that *after three dayes* he would raise the temple of his body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole dayes dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as Joseph and his mother, *after three dayes* found him in the temple, that is, the third day after he carried behind in Jerusalem. And when we read, that he was three dayes and three nights in the

† *Lazarus is said to be τετραταῖς, four days dead, that is, counting the day on which he dyed, and the day on which his sister spake so to our Saviour at his sepulchre. And being he was raised then, he rose τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, the*

fourth day. Our Saviour rose τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, and therefore he was τετραταῖς when he rose; and so the Fathers call him, as you may observe in the words last cited out of Athanasius. As we read in Plutarch, Σολῶς ὁ Ὀμιλῶν . . . ἡγῶναι, καὶ τετραταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτὸς ἀνίσταται, De his qui sero pun. And of that Spirit in a Boy possessed, who hated all women ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τετραταῖς καὶ πέντε καὶ ἑξαήμερον ἔζη, Philostratus l. 3. c. 12. What this τετραταῖς is, the Greek Grammarians will teach us. Περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου ἀναγὰρ τὸ τετὰς τριῶν ἡμερῶν, αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ πέντε τὸ τετὰς ἢ τετραταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν, αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ πέντε τὸ τετὰς ἢ τετραταῖς ὅσον αὐτὸς τὸ, ποσὺν δ' αὖ ἐξ αὐτῶν παύει; ἀπαντῶν τὸ τετὰς τριῶν ἢ τετραταῖς, ἡρῶν τελευτῶν ἡμέραν ἔγω ἀφ' ἧς παύεται ἢ πύργου, Schol. Eurip. Hecuba. Tetataῖς then, in respect of his coming to or from any place, is that person which is now the third day in or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the Greek language, then in the expression of a Tertian Fever, called so, because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. in which case there is but one day between, in which the patient is wholly free from his disease: from whence παρὰ μίαν, and τετραταῖς is the same in the language of the Physicians. This is excellently expressed by Alexander Aphrodisias in that problematicall Question, Διὰ τί ὁ αὐτὸς τετραταῖς ἐκ θερμῆς καὶ πυρὸς καὶ ἔχειν ὑποκρίσιν καὶ καταλύσιν, καὶ παρὰ μίαν καὶ τὴν ἑξῆς ἡμέραν, ἔχειν πάλιν τὸ φέβειν καὶ τὴν ἑξῆς ἡμέραν καὶ ὑποκρίσιν καὶ ἀνίκατον, ὁ δὲ τετραταῖς διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μίαν, Problem. 10. l. 2. The Quotidian ague hath its accessions καὶ ἡμέραν the Tertian παρὰ μίαν (sub. ἡμέραν) after one day of perfect intermission; the Quartan διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μίαν. In the same manner he mentions the μυστικὴν, the ἰσχυρικὴν, and ἐναυτικὴν: in all which this is constantly observable, that the dayes of perfect intermission are fewer by two, then the number in the name of the fever: for if the Fever be a τετραταῖς the day of intermission is but one, if τετραταῖς two, if τετραταῖς three, if ἰσχυρικὴν five, if ἐναυτικὴν seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and dyed the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise τετραταῖς; if he were two whole dayes in the grave, and he rose τετραταῖς. So Aristotle, Διὰ τί ὁ νυκτιγὰνς θερμὸς τετραταῖς ἀγέρει, πύργου ὅτι δύο μὲν καὶ ἀδυνάει ἀρῆς: καὶ τετὰς ἡμερῶν, Probl. 14. Sect. 26. τῇ τριτῇ therefore and τετραταῖς is the same. For from τριτῇ comes τετραταῖς, and from πύργου, τετραταῖς, &c. in which ἡμέραν is always understood. Τετραταῖς, τριεξήμερος. Suidas, Tetataῖς then is τριήμερος: ποσὺν δὲ τετραταῖς, διὰ τριῶν and τετραταῖς, διὰ πέντε. Thus being Christ did certainly rise τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, he did rise according to the Greeks τετραταῖς and according to the same then he must also rise παρὰ μίαν, that is, one day onely interceding between the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.

a Luke 2. 46.

O o

heart

Exod. 16. 5.

Mark 15. 42.

Luke 23. 54.

John 19. 32.

cording to that command in the case of Manna, *It shall come to passe that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.* This preparation being used both before the Sabbath and other Festivals, at this time it had both relations: for first, it was the preparation to a Sabbath, as appeareth by those words of S. Mark, *Now when the Even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath;* and those of S. Luke, *That day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.* Secondly, it was also the Eeve of a Festival, even of the great day of the Paschal solemnity, as appeareth by S. John, who saith, when Pilate set down in the judgement seat, *it was the Preparation of the Paschever.* And that the great Paschal festivity did then fall upon the Sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or Eeve of both, appeareth yet further by the same Evangelist, saying, *The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the Crosse on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was an high day;* that is, not onely an ordinary or weekly Sabbath, but also a great festival, even a Paschal Sabbath. Now being the Sabbath of the Jews was constant and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it followeth that the Preparation or Eeve thereof must necessarily be the sixth day of the week, which from the day, and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the Passion upon that day, we call *Good Friday.* And from that day being the sixt of one, the third must consequently be the † eighth or the first of the next week.

The next Character of this third day is the expression of the time of the Resurrection in the Evangelists. *When the Sabbath was past,* saith S. Mark, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, *very early in the morning the first day of the week.* *In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week,* saith S. Matthew. *Upon the first day of the week early in the morning,* saith S. Luke. *The first day of the week early when it was yet dark,* saith S. John. By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the preparation, which was the Eeve of the Sabbath, and continuing there the whole Sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and further resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that Sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning, was revived by the accession and union of his soule, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

Whereby it came to passe, that the obligation of the day, which was then the Sabbath, dyed and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation reviv'd again at his Resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appear'd upon which a far greater Redemption was con-

† Ὁρατε πως
λέγει, ὅτι τὴν
ἑβδόμη ἡμέρᾳ
ἐκείνῃ, ἀλλ' ὅτι
ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν ᾗ
καταπαύσας τὴν
πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡ-
μέρας ὅσους
ποιήσας, ὅτι ἐν
αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀρ-
χὴν διὰ καὶ αὐ-
τῶν τῶν ἡμέ-
ρας τῶν ὁσίων
ἐν ὑποστάσει,
ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ἀνίστη ἐκ νεκρῶν,
καὶ φανερώσει
ἀντίον ἐν αὐτῇ
ἡμέρᾳ. Barpaba
Epist. c. 1. 1.
Ἡ μὲν οὖν ὁρᾷ
πνευματικῶν ἀ-
νάστασις ἐν κο-
ριακῇ ἐν ὁσίων
ἡ κυριακῇ ὀνομα-
ζέσθαι. Theodosius
Epist. 1. Ἡ δὲ ὁ-
στήν τῆς ἀνα-
στάσεως καλεῖται ἡ
ὁσίων ἡμέρα ἐν
παντὶ ἀνα-
στῆναι τὰ θύνα-
μα, τὸ πᾶν ὅτι
τῆς ἀλυσίας

ἀναστάσεως ἡ ἀναστῆναι ὁσίων τῶν πλάτων καὶ ποικίλων, διὰ τὴν δὲ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐν μὲν ὁρᾷ ἑβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν Κυρίαν ἡμέραν. Μία γὰρ ὁρᾷ ἑβδόμῃ πρῶτη μέριμνα ἡ πᾶσιν ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ τὴν ἀεὶ μὲν πᾶσι ὁρᾷ πᾶσιν
ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κυριακῆς, ὁσίων καλεῖται, καὶ πρῶτη ὅσα ἡμέρᾳ. Iustinus Dial. cum Tryphone. Cum in septima die
Sabbati nomen sit & observantia constituta, tamen nos in octava die, quæ & ipsa prima est, perfecti
Sabbati festivitate lætamur. S. Hilar. Comm. in Psalm Prol. Hæc octava sententia quæ ad caput re-
dit, perfectumque hominem declarat, significatur fortasse & circumcissione octava die in veteri Testa-
mento, & Domini resurrectione post Sabbatum, quod est utique octavus idemque primus dies. S. Au-
gust. de Serm. Dom. in monte l. 1. c. 11. Καὶ τὴν ἰδὴ καὶ τὴν πρῶτην ἡμέραν ἀπαυτῇ πᾶσιν Κυριακῇ τῶν καὶ ὁ
πᾶσι πανηγυρίζον, ἀπεκρίθη ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ Κύριος ἡμεῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός τῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. διὰ καὶ
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις γραφαῖς καὶ πρῶτην καλεῖται, ὡς ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ ὑπέρβουτος, καὶ ὁσίων, ὅτι ὑπερέβηκε τὴν ἑβδόμην
ἑβδόμην. Theophilus Alexand. a Mark 16. 1, 2. b Matth. 28. 1. c Luke 24. 1. d John 20. 1.

firm'd.

firm'd. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the law we find this particular cause assigned, *Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arme, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.* Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation then any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendred in the body of the commandment it self. There was therefore a double reason rendred by God why the Jews should keep that Sabbath which they did; one Special, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other Individual, as to that seventh day, to signifie their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the Resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought then that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it then to that, the individual determination of the day did passe upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventhly return upon the reference to the Creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God; *This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you:* so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the Hebdomadall or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead, and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; *For by him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in the earth, all things were created by him and for him.*

This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God then any such inclination or intention of their own: For ^a *the same day* saith the Evangelist, that is the day on which Christ rose from the dead, *at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews.* The second observation was performed voluntarily, ^b *for after eight dayes again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them:* the first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God the Disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week, they are all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, ^c *when the day of Pentecost was fully come,* which was also the first day of the week, *they were all with one accord in one place,* and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached the Gospel, and the ^d *same day were added unto them about three thousand souls.* The same practise of convening we find continued in the following years. For ^e *upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them:* and the same Apostle gave expresse command concerning the collection for the Saints both to the Churches of Galatia and of Corinth,

Deut. 5. 15.

Exod. 12. 2.

Coloss. 1. 16.

a Joh. 20. 19.

b Joh. 20. 26.

c Acts 2. 1.

d 41.

e Acts 20. 7.

same God Jehovah, who did not onely create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought then that of Egypt: as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater Prophet then our Saviour: as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct dayes in the worship of God; so all which professe the Christian Religion are known publicly to belong unto the Church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly † separated from all other professions.

That Christ did thus rise from the dead, is a most necessary Article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and professe, to the meditation whereof the Apostle hath given a particular injunction, *a Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead.* First, because without it our faith is vain, and by vertue of it, strong. By this we are assured that he which dyed was the Lord of life, and though he were *b crucified through weaknesse, yet he liveth by the power of God.* By this resurrection from the dead, he *c was declared to be the Son of God,* and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, *d Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his resurrection he demonstrated his divinity.

Secondly, by the Resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons, and if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead it will be imputed to us for righteousness: For he *e was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.* By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the ** finnes* for which he suffered were not his own: had no man been a sinner he had not dyed; had he been a sinner he had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtē in remission of our finnes and justification of our persons. *f God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinfull flesh, for sin condemned sin in the flesh,* and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation, to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. *g Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed, yea rather that is risen again.*

Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the Resurrection of Christ as an Article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen and declare our hope. For *h the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled.* By the Resurrection of Christ his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and co-heirs with Christ. For

plan. in Psalm. 117. sub nomine Hieron. a 2 Tim. 2. 8. b 2 Cor. 13. 4. c Rom. 1. 4. d Acts 13. 33. e Rom. 4. 24, 25. * S. Chrysostome excellently upon that place, "Οπα πὸς τὴν αἰτίαν ἐμὴν αὐτὸς ὁ θς ἀνέστη, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ δόξα ἐστὶν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιῆσαι. Διὰ τί γὰρ ἰσχυροῦν, φησὶν; ὅτι οἰκείαν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ δόλον ἐκ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἀμαρτωλὸς, πῶς ἀνέστη; εἰ δὲ ἀνέστη, δίδωται ὅτι ἀμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἔστιν. εἰ δὲ ἀμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, πῶς ἰσχυροῦν; δι' ἵκεται; εἰ δὲ ἐτίμω, πῶς οὐκ ἀνέστη. f Rom. 8. 3. g Rom. 8. 33, 34. h 1 Pet. 1. 3.

† Quid hac die felicius, in qua Dominus Judæis mortuus est, nobis resurrexit? in qua Synagogæ cultus occubuit, & est ortus Ecclesiæ; in qua nos homines fecit secum surgere & vivere & sedere in celestibus, & impletum est illud quod ipse dixit in Evangelio, cum autem exaltatus fuero à terra omnia traham ad me. Hæc est dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus & lætemur in ea. Omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus, sed cæteri dies possunt esse Judæorum, possunt esse hæreticorum, possunt esse Gentilium; Dies Dominica, dies resurrectionis, dies Christianorum, dies nostra est, Ex-

if

- if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.* He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the *first-born from the dead*, and we *the sonnes of the Resurrection*. The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our head. *For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us.* Thus the Resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an Efficient, & as an Exemplary cause. As an Efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; *For as in Adam all dye, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* As an Exemplary cause, in regard that all the Saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of Christ; *For if we have been planted together in the likenesse of his death, we shall be also in the likenesse of his resurrection.* He shall change our vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body: That as we have borne the image of the earthy we may also bear the image of the heavenly. This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtain'd the power, and is become the pattern, of his resurrection. *The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up & have passed through the gate, their King shall passe before them, & the Lord on the head of them.*
- Fourthly, it is necessary to professe our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his Resurrection may effectually work it's proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. *When we were dead in sinnes, God quickened us together with Christ.* And, *as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newnesse of life.* To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen, is to incurre that reprehension of the Angel, *why seek ye the living among the dead?* To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or Christ is risen from the dead. Let then *the dead bury the dead*, but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. *Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.* There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection of the body. *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.*
- Having thus explained the manner of Christs resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend when he makes profession of this part of his Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much, I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and dyed for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself by reuniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the Sabbath, and resting in the grave the Sabbath day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe *the third day he rose again from the dead.*

so was the Messias here to offer up himself, and being slain to passe through all the courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest heavens, the most glorious seat of the Majesty of God. Thus Christs Ascension was represented typically.

a Psal. 68. 18.

This place must necessarily be understood of the Messias, by reason of that high place to which no other conquerour as-

scended. For that לָרוֹם in the language of the Prophet is attributed to God, as Psal.

7. 8. שׁוֹבֵר לָרוֹם, re-

turn on high, that is in the language of the Chaldee Pa-

raphrase, לְכִי, שׁוֹבֵר חַיִּים, re-

turn to the house of thy

majesty; and Psalm 93. 4.

אֲדִיר בַּמָּרוֹם יְהוָה, the Lord on

high is mighty, Chald.

בְּשָׁמַי מְרוֹמָא, in the upper

heavens, Psal. 71. 19. Thy

righteous-

ness, O Lord, is עֲדָרוֹם uf-

que ad excel-

sum; the Chaldee, again,

עַד שְׁמַי מְרוֹמָא, in the same

manner in this place, עֲלִיָּה, לָרוֹם, thou

hast ascended on high, the Chaldee Paraphrase translates לְרִיקִי סִלְחָא thou hast ascended the firmament: and he addeth immediately נִבִּיא מֹשֶׁה O thou prophet Moses: yet there is a plain contradiction in that interpretation; for if it were meant of Moses, it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament it cannot be understood of Mo-

ses, for he never ascended thither. * This breaker up is by the confession of the Jews the title of the Messias. So the Author of Sepher Abchath Ruchal in his description of the coming of the Messias maketh use of this place. And the same appeareth further by that saying of Moses Haddarshan in Erefshit Rabba, נִשְׁעָר מִלְּמַסָּה, הוּא אֲבוֹתָם נִשְׁעָר מִלְּמַסָּה הוּא מִשֵּׁחָ שֶׁן עֲלֵה הַפָּרָק לַפְּנִימָה וְנֹו:

The plantation from below is Abraham, the plantation from above is Messias, as it is written, The breaker is come up before them, &c. So he on Gen.

40. 9. Again the same Erefshit Rabba Gen. 44. 18. אֲמַתִּי נִשְׁעָרֻהוּ הַלֵּוִי הַשְּׂכִינָה עַל הַר הַחַיִּים, When shall we rejoyce? when the feet of the Shecinah shall stand upon the mount of Olives; and again,

אֲמַתִּי נִשְׁעָרֻהוּ הַלֵּוִי הַשְּׂכִינָה מִנְּהֻמָּה וְהַשְּׂכִינָה בְּרֹאשׁ שֶׁן וְיִקְרַח מִלְּכָם לַפְּנִימָה וְיִחַה בְּרֹאשׁ, When? when the captives shall ascend from Hell, and Shecinah in the head, as it is written (Mich. 2. 13.) Their King shall passe before them, and the Lord in the head of them.

b Iohn 20. 17. c Iohn 3. 13.

The same Ascension was also declar'd prophetically, as we read in the Prophet David, ^a Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men: which phrase on high in the language of David signifying heaven, could be applied properly to no other conquerour but the Messias, not to Moses, not to David; not to Joshuah, not to any but the Christ; who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and triumphing over them to ascend unto the highest heaven, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sonnes of men. The Prophecy of Micah did foretell as much, even in the opinion and confession of the ^{*} Jews themselves, by those words, The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it, and their King shall passe before them, and the Lord at the head of them. And thus Christs Ascension was declar'd prophetically as well as typically; which was our first Consideration.

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised Messias, was truly and really performed by our Jesus. That onely begotten and eternal Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did by a local transfiguration of his humane nature, really and truly ascend from this earth below on which he lived, into the heavens above, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body, and the soul, with which he liv'd and dyed and rose again.

The Ascent of Christ into heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but only that he obtained a more heavenly & glorious state or condition after his Resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of Christ when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his Ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to Mary, ^b Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father. Although he had said before to Nicodemus, ^c No man ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven; which words imply that he had then ascended: yet even those concern not this Ascension. For that was therefore only true, because the Son of man, not yet conceived in the Virgins womb, was not in heaven, & after his conception by virtue of the hypostatical union was in heaven; from whence speaking after the manner of men, he might well say, that he had ascended into heaven; because whatsoever was first on earth

and then in heaven we say ascended into heaven. Wherefore beside that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his Resurrection, there was yet another and that more proper Ascension: for after he had both those wayes ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of Ascension, by which Christ had not yet ascended when he spake to Mary after his resurrection, was not after to be performed; for at the same time he said unto Mary, *Goe to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father.* And when this Ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man as man from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For when he had spoken unto the Disciples, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, even while he blessed them he parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up. This was a visible departure, as it is described, a real removing of that body of Christ which was before present with the Apostles; and that body living after the Resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it: and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

Thus was Christs Ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the Apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. † They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended; because an eye witness was not necessary unto the act of his Resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his Ascension. It was sufficient that Christ shewed himself to the Apostles alive after his passion; for being they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again: for whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his resurrection. But being the Apostles were not to see our Saviour in heaven, being the session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye witnesses of the act who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

Beside the eye witness of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the Angels; those blessed Spirits which ministred before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that Christ ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came: and* because the eyes of the Apostles could not follow him so far, the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception; For a behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, *Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him goe into heaven.* We must therefore acknow-

Luke 24. 50.

51.

Acts 1.9, 10.

† Βλεπόντων αὐτῶν
ἐκ ἀνάστη, ἐλ-
πόντων δὲ παρῆν-
ἐκεῖθεν ἀποῦσα
ἡ ἑκείνη τὸ πᾶν ἰ-
σοῦσε. καὶ γὰρ τῆς
ἀναστάσεως τὸ
αὐτὸ τέλος εἶδον,
τὴν δὲ ἀρροῦν καί-
τι καὶ τῆς ἀνα-
στάσεως τὴν αὐτὴν
ἀρχὴν εἶδον, τὸ
δὲ τέλος οὐκ εἶδον.
παρέλκει γὰρ ἡ
κείνη τὸ πᾶν ἀρ-
χὴν εἶδον, αὐτὴ
τὴν αὐτὴν φθέρ-
ουσαν παρῆντος,
καὶ τὸ μυστικὸς
ὁμιλεῖται ὅτι
ἐκ ἑστῆς ἐκεῖ ἀλ-
λὰ τὸ μυστικὸν τὸ
λόγικον ἡμαρτίν.
S. Chr. Hom. 2.
in Act. Apost.
* Ἐπειδὴ ἐκ
ἀρχῆς οἱ ἁ-
γγέλαι δέξαν-
το αὐτόν, καὶ
παύσονται πᾶ-
σι τοῖς τῶν ἁ-

αὐτὸν εἶδον δὲ οἱ αἱ εἰς τὸ ἁγίον, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἑστῆσαν ἐκ αὐτῶν διακρίσει αὐτὸς αὐτὸς (πρόσθετον γὰρ
ἐκείνην ἰδόντες γινώσκουσι) ὅτι ἡ εἰς τὸν ἁγίον ἀναλαμβάνει, αὐτὸν λοιπὸν ἰδόντων οἱ ἁγγέλαι. S. Chrys. Hom. 2. in Act.
Apost. a. Acts 1. 10, 11.

must understand thereby the heaven of heavens or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the soul of Christ to have passed far above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the † Sun.

It was necessary to professe this Article of Christs Ascension, first for the confirmation and augmentation of our Faith. Our Faith is thereby confirm'd, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father; his Father sent him, and we have received the message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for deliver ing it. Our Faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being the *a evidence of things not seen*. The further the Object is removed from us, the more of *†* faith hath that act which embraceth it. Christ said unto Thomas, *b because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*: and that blessednesse by his Ascension he hath left to the whole Church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our faith; and by vertue of his being in heaven our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown of our faith; because he ascended we the more believe, and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but being our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him. He is our head, and where that is, the members may expect admission: for in so great and intimate an union there is no fear of separation or exclusion. ^c *There are many mansions in his Fathers house.* And when he spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his Disciples, *I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again, and receive you unto my self, that where I am, there ye may be also.* The [†] first fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. ^d *This is the new and living way which he consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh.* And hence we ^e *have our hope as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, which entereth into that within the vail, whither the forerunner is for*

† The Selen-
ciani and Her-
miani taught
that the body
of Christ as-
cended no fur-
ther than the
Sun, in which
it was deposit-
ed; of whom
Philastrius,
and our offi-
ce Austin thus,
Necant Sal-
vatore[m] in
carne federe
ad dextram
Patris, sed ea
fe exultis per-
hibent eamq[ue]
in Sole pos-
suiffe, acci-
pientes occa-
sionem de
Psalmo, In
Sole posuit
Tabernaculum
suum, &c. f.
59. The same
opinion Gregory
Nazianzen
attributeth to
the Mani-
cheans, Πῶ γὰρ
τὸ σῶμα τοῦ
ἐκ μὲν τῆς οὐ-
ρανίας ἀποβί-
ου διὰ τῆς Μα-
ριανᾶς ἡμῶν
τοῦ λόγου ἐπα-
ρίστηεν ἐν αὐ-
τῇ δια μέ-
της ἀντι-
πας, Epist. i.
ad Cledonium.

And S. Austin says they taught the Sun to be chriſt, Manichæi Solem iſtum oculis carnis viſibilem, expolitum & publicum, non tantum hominibus ſed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Chriſtum Dominum eſſe putarunt, *Tract.* 34. in *Iob.* *This opinion is more clearly ſet down, but without a name, in the Caſena Patrum on the 13. Pſalm,* Οὐ γὰρ ἀνοσκήτων τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς φημι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡ σωτὴρ ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώποις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι. *This verſe the old Heretiſts of Hermogenes as is related by Theodoret,* Οὗτος (ὁ Ἑρμογόνης) τὸν Κοῦρον ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ παντὶ φημι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι. *Hæret. Fab.* l. i. c. 19. *2 Heb.* l. i. t. 7. Magnarum hic vigo: eſt mentium, & valde fidelium lumen eſt animarum, incunſtanter credere quæ corporeo non videntur intuitu, & ibi fide deſiderium quo nequeas inferre conſpectum. Hæc autem pietas unde in noſtris cordibus naſceretur, aut quomodo quifquam juſtificaretur per fidem, ſi in iis tantum ſalus noſtra conſiſteret quæ obtutibus ſubjacerent? *Leo de Aſcen. Serm.* 2. Fides eorum qui Deum viuunt, quamdiu peregrinantur cotida mundantur, quod non videt credit, nam ſi vides non eſt fides: credenti colligitur meritum, videnti redditur præmium. Ergo Dominus & paret locum: eat ne videatur, lateat ut credatur: tunc enim locus paratur, ſi ex fide vivatur: creditus deſideratur ut deſideratus habeatur, deſiderium dilectionis præparatio nam moriſis, *S. Aug. Tract.* 68. in *Iob.* b *Iob.* 20. 29. + Chriſti aſcenſio noſtra proſpectio eſt; & quo præceſſit gloria capitis, eo ſpes vocatur & corporis, *Leo de Aſcen. Serm.* 1. c *Iob.* 14. 3. * Διὸ καὶ ποτὶς ὁρεῖται ὁ Χρῖςτος ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι. *S. Chryſ. Orat.* 1. de *Aſcenſ.* Διὸ καὶ ποτὶς ὁρεῖται ὁ Χρῖςτος ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τοῖς ζώοντι. *Ibid.* *Orat.* 2. d *Heb.* l. 10. c. *2 Heb.* 6. 19, 20.

Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself when he was to depart from his Disciples grounded the necessity of his departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, *If I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you.* Now if all the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe, depend upon the certain information which the Apostles had, and those Apostles appear to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues had sit upon them, it was first absolutely necessarily that the Holy Ghost should so descend. Again, being it was impossible that the Spirit of God in that manner should come down, untill the Son of God had ascended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate had entred upon his office in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confesse that Ascension.

John 16. 7.

Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confesse in those words of our Creed, *He ascended into heaven*: for thereby he is understood to expresse thus much, I am fully perswaded, that the onely begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestiaall Orbs, until he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the Majesty of God. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who *ascended into heaven*.

And sitteth on the Right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THe second part of the Article containeth two Particulars; the Session of the Son, and the Description of the Father: the first sheweth that Christ upon his ascension is set down *at the right hand of God*: the second assureth us that the God, at whose right hand Christ is set down, is the *Father Almighty*.

For the explication of Christs Session, three things will be necessary; First, to prove that the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God; Secondly, to shew that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, is set down at the right hand of God; Thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to Christ.

That the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God, was both pretypified and foretold. Joseph who was betrayed and sold by his brethren was an expresse type of Christ, and though in many things he represented the Messias, yet in none more then in this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the supreme power of Egypt. For thus Pharaoh spake to Joseph, *Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; onely in the throne will I be greater then thou.* And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon Josephs hand, and araid him in vestures of fine linnen, and put a gold chain about his neck; And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and rejoyced before him,

Gen. 41. 40, 42, 43.

Bo

Again, our Saviour urg'd this Scripture against the Pharisees, saying, *What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? they say unto him, The Son of David, He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is the his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word.* From whence 'tis evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most accurate and skilfull amongst them, did interpret the Psalm of the Messias; for if they had conceiv'd the prophesie belonged either to Abraham, or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionlesse would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of David. It was therefore the general opinion of the Church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers † Rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the Kingdome of Christ. And thus the Session of the Messias at the right hand of God was not onely represented typically, but foretold prophetically: which is our first Consideration.

Secondly, we affirm, that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true Messias, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit down at the right hand of God. His Ascension was the way to his Session, and his Session the end of his Ascension; as the Evangelist expresseth it, *a He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God; or as the Apostle, God raised Christ from the dead; and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.* There could be no such Session without an Ascension; *b* and David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thy foes thy foot-stool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, let all the blind and wilfull Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand neither Abraham nor David, neither Ezechias nor Zerubabel, but hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ.*

This was an honour never given, never promised to any man, but the Messias: the glorious Spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them set down at the right hand of God. *c* For to which of his Angels said he at any time, *Sit on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot stool.* But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the Council of the Chief Priests and Elders of the people, when he foresaw his death contrived, and his Crosse prepared, even then he exprest the confidence of his expectation, saying, *d Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.* And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised Messias, *e* is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. Which was our second Consideration.

Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto Christ. The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically: First therefore, we must consider what is the *right hand of God*, in the language of the Scriptures; Secondly, what is it to *sit down at that right hand*. God being a Spirit can have no materiall or corporeall parts; and consequently as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no † hands at all: but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity; and not onely to speak by the mouthes of men, but also after the

† As in the Midrash Tiltim, Ps. 118. 36. אר ידן כשר חמא לעתיד הבן מרשיב מלך המשיח לימנעו שנ' נאם "לארני שב לימני:

R. Toden in the name of Rabbi Chama said that in the time to come God shall place Messias the King at his right hand, as it is written (Ps. 110. 1.) The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand. So Moses Haddarshan on Gen. 18. Hereafter God holy & blessed shall set the King Messias לימני on his right hand, as it is written. (Ps. 110.) The Lord said, &c. a Mark 16. 19. b Acts 2. 34. 35. 36. c Heb. 1. 13. d Luke 22. 69. e 1 Pet. 3. 22. † Credimus etiam quod sedet ad dextram Dei Patris. Nec ideo tamen quasi humana forma circumscriptum esse Deum Patrem arbitrandum est, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut sinistram laus animo occurrat, S. Aug. De Fide & Symb.

* Succedunt
brachia & va-
lidi lacerto-
rum tori, va-
lidæ ad ope-
randum ma-
nus, & proce-
ribus digitis
habiles ad te-
nendum:
Hinc aptior
usus operan-
di, hinc scri-
bendi elegan-
tia, & ille ca-
lamus scribæ
velociter scri-
bentis, quo
divinæ vocis
exprimuntur
oracula. Ma-
nus est quæ
cibum ori mi-
nistret; ma-
nus est quæ
præclaris e-
nitet factis,
quæ concili-
atrix divinæ
gratiæ sacris
infertur alta-
ribus, per
quam offeri-
mus & sumi-
mus sacra-
menta coele-
stia. Manus
est quæ ope-
ratur pariter
atque dispen-
sat divina
mysteria, cu-
jus vocabulo
non dedigna-
tus est se Dei
Filius decla-
rari, dicente
David, *Dex-
tera Domini
exaltavit me.*

Manus est quæ fecit omnia, sicut dixit Deus omnipotens, *Nonne manus mea fecit hæc?* S. Ambros. *Hexam. l. 6. c. 9.* a 1 Kings 2. 19. b Psal. 16. 11. c Matth. 27. 64. Mark 14. 62. Luke 22. 69. † Secun-
dum consuetudinem nostram illi confessus offertur qui aliquo opere perfecto honoris gratia promere-
tur ut sedeat. Ita ergo & homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolus superans, resurrectione sua
inferna referans, tanquam perfecto opere ad cælos victor adveniens, audit à Deo Patre. *Sede ad
dexteram meam.* Max. Taurin. Hom. 1. de Pentecoste. d Heb. 1. 3. e Heb. 8. 1. * Ad dextram intel-
ligendum est dictum esse in summa beatitudine, ubi iustitia & pax & gaudium est. S. Aug. de Fide &
Symb. Quid est Patris dextera, nisi illa æterna ineffabilisque felicitas quo pervenit Filius hominis,
etiam carnis immortalitate percepta? Idem contra Sermon. Arrian. Beatus est & à beatitudine, quæ dex-
tera Patris vocatur; ipsius beatitudinis nomen est dextera Patris, De Symb. ad Catech. Salus temporalis
& carnalis in sinistra est, salus æterna cum Angelis in dextra est. Ideo jam in ipsa immortalitate positus
Christus dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in seipso dextram aut sinistram; sed dex-
tera Dei dicitur felicitas illa, quæ quoniam ostendi non potest tale nomen accepit, S. Aug. in Ps. 137.

manner

manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organi-
call parts which are most * active, and executive of our power; by
those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natu-
rall and artificial actions are perform'd by them. From whence the
power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power is signi-
fied by the hand of God. Moreover being by a general custome of
the world the right hand is more used then the left, and by that ge-
neral use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the
right hand of God signifieth the exceeding great and infinite power
of God.

Again, because the most honourable place amongst men is the
right hand (as when Bathsheba went unto King Solomon, ^a *he sate
down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the Kings mother, and
she sate on his right hand*) therefore the right hand of God signifies the
glorious majesty of God.

Thirdly, because the gifts of men are given and received by the
hands of men, and every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights,
therefore the right hand of God is the place of celestial happinesse
and perfect felicity; according to that of the Psalmist, ^b *In thy presence
is fulnesse of joy, at thy right hand pleasures for ever more.*

Now as to the first acception of the right hand of God, Christ is
said to sit down at the right hand of the Father in regard of that ab-
solute power and dominion which he hath obtained in heavens; from
whence it is expressly said, ^c *Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on
the right hand of power.*

As to the second acception, Christ is said to sit on the right hand
of God in regard of that † honour, glory, and Majesty which he
hath obtained there; wherefore it is said, ^d *When he had by himself pur-
ged our sinnes he sate down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:* and
again, ^e *We have an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of
the Majesty in the heavens.*

In reference to the third acception Christ is said to sit on the right
hand of God, because now after all the labours and sorrows of this
world, after his stripes and buffetings, after a painfull and shamefull
death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy, and everlasting * feli-
city.

As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his *Session*, we must
not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the hea-
vens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs.
For we read in the Scriptures a more generall term which signifies
onely his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular

manner of his presence. So S. Paul, *who is even at the right hand of God;* and S. Peter, *Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God.* Beside, we find him express'd in another position then that of Session: for *Stephen looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And said, Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.* He appeared standing unto Stephen, whom we expresse sitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occasion, then a diversity of position. He appeared † standing to Stephen as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to receive him: and he is oftner expressed *sitting*, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effect, and operation.

This phrase then to *fit*, prescinding from the corporal posture of Session, may signifie no more then habitation, possession, permanſion, and continuance; as the ſame word in the † Hebrew, and Greek languages often ſignifies. And thus our Saviour is ſet down at the right hand of God in heaven, becauſe he which dwelt with us before on earth, is now aſcended up into heaven, and hath taken his manſion or habitation there; and ſo hath he ſeated himſelf, and * dwelleth in the higheſt heavens.

Again, the Notion of *fitting* implieth rest, quietnesse and indisturbance; according to that promise in the Prophet, *a They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.* So Christ is ascended into heaven, where resting from all paines and sorrows,

dextris Dei? Quid est illud, ut hic subjectus videatur p^rsenti triumphos, & illic quasi dominus antequam vinceret? Prout causa erat fecisse, ita & Dominus se ostendit. Prophetæ enim vires et quasi rex corripiens plebem, & hoc se ostendit quod erat, hoc est, sedentem, in pace enim erat causa divinitatis ejus. Stephanus autem ut itans appareret fecit columnia Judæorum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris causa vim patiebatur. Ideo sedente Iudice Deo itans apparuit, quasi qui causam diceret; & quia bona causa ejus est, ad dextram Iudicis erat; Omnis qui causam dicit, sibi necesse est, S. Aug. Quest. in Novum Test. 88. Sedere iudicanis est, stare vero pugnantibus adjuvantis. Stephanus ergo in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit. Sed hunc post ascensionem Marcus federe scribit, quia post ascensionis suę gloriam Iudex in fine videbitur, Greg. Homil. 29. in Evang. Maximus Taurin. de Penecoste Homil. 1. movet he Questionē, Quæ sit ratio quod idem Dominus à David sedens prophetatur, itans vero à Stephano prædicatur? et tamen renders this reason, Ut modo ejus omnipotentia, modo misericordia describatur. Nam utrique pro potestate regis federe diciūtur, pro bonitate intercessoris stare suggeritur. At enim beatus Apostolus, quia Advocatum halemus apud Patrem Jesum Christum. Iudex est igitur Christus cum residet, Advocatus cum assurgit. Iudex plane Iudeis, Advocatus Christianis. Hic enim stans apud Patrem Christianorum licet peccantium causas exorati ibi residet cum Patre Phariseorum persecutorum peccata condemnans. Illis indignans vehementer ulciscitur; his interveniens leniter miseretur. Hic stat ut suscipiat Stephani Martyris spiritum; ibi residet ut condemnet Iudæ proditoris admissum. † ידו which properly signifies to sit, is familiarly used for permanent and habitavit; as Ind. §. 17. אשר ישב לרוח ימים, LXX. ἄσπις ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀπὸ δεξιᾶς αὐτοῦ, Αλther continued on the sea shore, Lev. 8. 35. ויחם אהל כבוד השׁן בו וילכו שבעה ימים והיה קול ה' מן העמוד ותראה את אלהים. Therefore shall ye abide at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, day and night, seven days. Upon which place S. Aug. Quid est quod dicit Moyses ad Aaron & filios ejus cum sanctificatione ad ineundum sacerdotium? Ad osium tabernaculi testimonii sedebitis septem dies, die & nocte, ne moriamini. Numquid nam credibile est situ corporis uno loco sedere preceptos per dies septem die & nocte, unde se omnino non commovere? Nec tamen hic tanquam allegorie aliquid significatum, quod non fieret, cogendi sumus accipere, sed potius agnoscere locutionem Scripturarum, ubi Sessionem pro habitatione & commemoratione posuit. Non enim quia dictum est de Semei quod sederet in Hierusalem annos tres, ideo putandum est per totum illud tempus in sella sessidisse & non furrexisse. Hinc & sedes dicuntur, ubi habent commemorationem quorum sedes sunt; habitatio quippe hoc nomen accepit, Quest. super Levit. 24. And this is as familiar with the Latines as the Hebrews. Si venti essent, nos hic Corcyræ non sederemus, Cic. l. 9. Epist. Id horreum fuit præsidium Poenis sedentibus ad Trebiam, Liv. l. 2. de Bello Pun. * Sederat ad dexteram Patris. Credite, Sedere intelligite habitare; quomodo dicimus de quoocunque homine, in ista patriā sedet per tres annos. Dicit illud & Scriptura sedisse quandam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid sedit, & nunquam surrexit? Ideo hominum habitationes sedes dicuntur. Ubi habitantur sedes, numquid semper sedetur, non surgitur, non ambulatur? Et tamen sedes vocantur. Sic ergo credite habitare Christum in dextera Dei Patris ubi est, Author lib. de Symb. ad Carech.

Rom. 8. 34.
1 Pet. 3. 22.
Ἐπεὶ τὸ εἰπὴν
καθῆσθαι φορε-
τικὸν αὐτοῖς ἦν,
τίως τὸ ἀεὶ τῆς
ἀναστῆσεως κατὰ
λόγον καὶ φασὶν
αὐτὸν ἵστασθαι,
S. chrys. Hom.
18. in Acta.

Si major gra-
tia & manife-
statio intelli-
gentia in No-
vo est quam
in Vetere Te-
stamento,
quare Esaias
Propheta se-
dentem in
throno Maje-
statis vidit
Deū Sabaoth,
in Novo au-
tem Stepha-
nus primus
Martyr stan-
tem se vidisse
ait. Iesum ē

he is seated, free from all disturbance and opposition; God having placed him at his right hand, untill he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Thirdly, this *sitting* implyeth yet more then quietnesse or continuance, even † dominion, soveraignty, and Majesty; as when Solomon sate in the throne of his Father, he raigned over Israel after the death of his Father. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. And S. Paul did well interpret those words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool, saying, He must raign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

Fourthly, this *sitting* doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of Judicature, and so especially expresseth ^a a King that sitteth in the throne of Judgement; as it is written, ^b In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgement, and hastening righteousnesse. And so Christ sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to sit doth not signifie any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happinesse of condition, regal and judicary power; as in other † Authors such significations are usuall.

The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the Doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediators solemn entry upon his Regal Office, as to the execution of that full Dominion which was due unto him. For ^c worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honour and glory and blessing. Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, ^d All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. For ^e because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Crosse, Therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not onely in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.

There was an expresse promise made by God to David, ^f Thine house and thy Kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever. This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditionall: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expresse'd, ^g Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my Covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore. Notwithstanding this

Author. l. 3. de Symb. ad Catechum. † Most anciently sedere did signifie no more then esse, to be in any place; as Servius noteth on that place of Virgil *Aeneid. 9.* Luco tum forte parentis Pili Turius sacrata valle sedebat. Sedebat, ut Asper dicit, erat. Quae clausula antiqua est, & de usu remota. And then he goes on to shew that sedere is taken for that which men are wont to do sitting. Secundum Plautum autem sedere est consilium capere, qui inducit in Mostellaria servum dicentem, Sine juxta aram sedeam & dabo meliora consilia. Sed secundum Augures Sedere est augurium captare: Namque post designatas coeli partes a sedentibus captabantur auguria. Quod & supra ipse ostendit latenter, inducens Picum solum sedentem, ut, Parvoque sedebat Succinctus irabea, quod est augurum, cum alios stantes induxerit. Ergo Sedebat, aut erat, aut consilia capiebat, aut augurabatur. c Revel. 5. 12. d Matth. 28. 18. e Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10. f 2 Sam. 7. 16. g Psal. 132. 12.

promise

promise this Kingdome of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the Kingdome was first rent from his posterity, next the regality it self; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but onely ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of David did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of David was not by an uninterrupted lineall succession established to perpetuity.

But yet in a larger and a better sense, after these intermissions, the throne of David was continued. When they had sinned and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdome was to be given unto him who never sinn'd, and consequently could never lose it; and he being of the seed of David, in him the throne of David was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the Angel Gabriel speak at his conception, *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdome there shall be no end.* Thus the throne of Christ is called the throne of David, because it was promised unto David, and because the kingdome of David was a type, resemblance and representation of it; inasmuch that Christ himself in respect of this kingdome is † often called David, as particularly in that promise, *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them.*

Luke. 32. 33.

† Ier. 30. 9.
Ezech. 37. 24.
25. Hof. 3. 5.
Ezech. 34. 23.
24.

Now as David was not onely first designed but also anointed King over Israel, and yet had no possession of the Crown; Seven years he continued anointed by Samuel, and had no share in the Dominion; seaven years after he continued anointed in Hebron onely King over the tribe of Judah; at last he was received by all the Tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regall power over all Israel, and seated himself in the royall city of Jerusalem: So Christ was born King of the Jews, and the conjunction of his humane nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient union to his Regall Office, yet as the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his *Kingdome was not of this world*; but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in Hebron with his own Tribe he tells the Apostles, *All power is given unto him*, and by virtue thereof, gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the Jerusalem above, & there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could S. Peter say, *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.*

1 Sam. 16. 13.

2 Sam. 2. 4.

Acts 2. 36.

The immediate effect of this Regall power, the proper execution of this Office, is the subduing of all his Enemies; For he is *set down on the right hand of God, from hence forth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.* This was the ancient custome of the Orientall conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when Joshua had the five Kings as his prisoners, he *said unto the men of war which went with him, Come neer, put your feet upon the necks of them.* Thus to signifie the absolute and totall conquest of Christ, and the dreadfull Majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lye down before him, and he set his feet upon them.

Heb. 10. 12.
13.

Ios. 10. 24.

The

The Enemies of Christ are of two kinds, either Temporal or Spiritual; The Temporal enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his Apostles, and all those which professe to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the Jews, who rejected, persecuted and crucified him; who after his Resurrection, scourged, stoned, and despihtfully used his disciples; who tryed all wayes and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his Regal Office was to subdue these enemies, and he set down on the right hand of God that they might be made his footstool: which they suddenly were according to his prediction, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the son of man coming in his Kingdome.* For within few years the Temple, the City, and the whole Polity of the Jews were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the Romans, which they made use of to crucifie the Lord of life. The Romans themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the Jews in Christs crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen Deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of Kings, and so they were, when Rome the regnant City, the head of that vast Empire, was taken and sack'd; when the Christians were preserved and the Heathens perished; when the worship of all their Idols ceased, and the whole Roman Empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and Nations whatsoever which openly oppose and persecute the name of Christ, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth, to be slain.

Mat. 16. 28.

The Spirituall Enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to Christs dominion, as Sin, Satan, Death. Every one of these hath a Kingdome of it's own, set up & opposed to the Kingdome of Christ. The Apostle hath taught us, that *sin hath reigned unto death*; and hath commanded us not to *let it reign in our mortall bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof.* There is therefore a dominion and Kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have been like the most high, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is *the Prince of this world: the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the Prince of the power of the air*; and thus the rulers of the darknesse of this world oppose themselves to the true light of the world. Death also hath it's dominion, and, as the Apostle speaks, *reigned from Adam to Moses; even by one offence death reigned by one*, and so set up a ruling and a regall power against the Prince of life.

Rom. 5. 21.

Iob. 12. 13.

Eph. 22. 6, 12.

Rom. 5. 14, 17.

1st. 3. 15.

For the destruction of these powers was Christ exalted to the right hand of God, and by his Regall office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universall, but that Sin, Satan, and Death shall still continue. 'Tis true he shall *put down all rule and authority and power*, but this amounts not so much to a totall destruction, as to an absolute subjection: for as he is *able*, so will he *subdue all things unto himself.* The principall end of the Regall office of the Mediator is the effectuall redemption and actuall salvation of all those whom God hath given him, and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these is by that opposition constituted and become an Enemy of Christ. And because this

1 Cor. 15. 24.

Phil. 3. 21.

this Enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as any thing opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far it is an Enemy, and no farther: And consequently, Christ by sitting at the right hand of God hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spiritual enemies so far as they make this opposition; and further then they doe oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindreth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdome, for the demonstration of Gods mercy is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

Christ then as King destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his Kingdome, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habituall. But in the reprobate and damned souls the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in it's absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing Rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

Again, Christ sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of hell: by virtue of his death, perpetually repented to his Father, he *destroyeth him that had the power of Death, that is, the Devil*. But the actual destruction of these powers of darknesse hath reference onely to the Elect of God. In them he preventeth the *wiles*; those he taketh out of the *snare*; in them he destroyeth the *works*; those he preserveth from the *condemnation of the Devil*. He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace, he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the divine justice.

Thirdly, Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death it self: For the *last enemy which shall be destroyed is death*. But this destruction reacheth no further then removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by Christ into the full possession of his heavenly kingdome. He *will ransom them from the power of the grave, he will redeem them from death. O death, he will be thy plagues; O grave, he will be thy destruction*. The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be fram'd again out of the dust, and the souls which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return to life, and death shall be *swallowed up in victory*. The sons of God shall then be made compleatly happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light*. But to the Reprobate and damned persons death is not destroyed but improv'd. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a *second*, and a far worse death. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of God that he might subdue all things to himself.

The Regall power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship, is
to

Heb. 2. 14.

Ephes. 6. 11.

2 Tim. 2. 26.

1 John. 3. 8.

1 Timoth. 3. 6.

1 Cor. 15. 26.

Hos. 13. 14.

1 Cor. 15. 54.

1 Cor. 15. 25. to continue all till those Enemies be subdued. *For he must reign till he*
 Heb. 2. 8. *hath put all enemies under his feet. But now we see not yet all things*
put under him, Therefore he must still continue there: and this ne-
 Psal. 110. 1. cessity is grounded upon the promise of the Father, and the expe-
Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine ene-
mies thy foot stool, saith the Father; upon which words we may ground
 as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the
 Heb. 10. 12, 13. Father the Son *sate down at the right hand of God, from henceforth ex-*
pecting till his enemies be made his footstool. Being then the promise of
 God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of Christ cannot
 be frustrated, it followeth that our Mediator shall exercise the
 Regall power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be
 subdued.

When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the cho-
 sen of God shall be actually brought into his Kingdome, when those
 which refused him to rule over them, shall be slain, that is, when the
 whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfill'd, then
 every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall
 no longer continue any act of the Prophetical part to instruct us, nor
 any act of the Priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no
 further act of this Regall power of the Mediator necessary to defend
 and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information
 and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and interces-
 sion, and perfect security will need no actual defence and prote-
 ction. As therefore the general notion of a Mediator ceaseth when
 Gal. 3. 20. all are made one, because a Mediator is not a Mediator of one; so every
 part or branch of that Mediatorship, as such, must also cease, be-
 cause that unity is in all parts compleat. Then cometh the end;
 when he shall have delivered up the Kingdome of God, even the Father;
 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For
 when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself
 be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be
 all in all.

Videamus an
 traditio regni
 defectio sit
 intelligenda
 regnandi, ut
 quod tradidit
 Filius Patri
 tradendo non
 teneat, S. Hi-
 lar. l. 1. 11.

2 Tim. 2. 12.

Rev. 11. 15.

Now though the Mediatorship of Christ be then resigned, be-
 cause the end thereof will then be performed; though the Regall
 Office as part of that Mediatorship be also resigned with the
 whole; yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a King,
 or loose any of the power and honour which before he had. The
 dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suf-
 fered: and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is
 done. He hath promised to make us Kings and Priests, which
 honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall reign with him
 for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him King. The
 kingdomes of this world are become the kingdomes of the Lord, and of his
 Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever, not onely to the modi-
 ficated eternity of his Mediatorship, so long as there shall be need
 of Regall power to subdue the enemies of Gods elect; but also to
 the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for
 the future is coeternal to his Divinity.

Least we should imagine that Christ should ever cease to
 be King, or so interpret this Article, as if he were after the
 day of judgement to be removed from the right hand of God,
 the Ancient Fathers added those words to the Nicene Creed,
 † whose

† *whose kingdome shall have none end*, against the Hereſie which then aroſe denying the eternitie of the Kingdome of Chriſt.

The profession of faith in Christ as sitting on the right hand of God is necessary; First, to mind us of our duty, which must needs consist in subjection and obedience. The Majesty of a King claimeth the loyalty of a Subject; and if we acknowledge his authority, we must submit unto his power. Nor can there be a greater incitation to obedience, then the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be whether we will or no; but if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom; if unwillingly, then is our averfeness everlasting misery. † Enemies we all have been, under his feet we shall be, either adopted or subdued. A * double Kingdom there is of Christ; one of power, in which all are under him; another of Propriety, in those which belong unto him: none of us can be excepted from the first; and happy are we if by our obedience we shew our selves to have an interest in the second; for then that Kingdom is not onely Christ's but ours.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe in Christ sitting on the right hand of God, that we might be assured of an auspicious protection under his gracious dominion. For God by this exaltation hath given our Saviour *to be the head over all things to the Church*; and therefore from him we may expect direction and preservation. There can be no illegality where Christ is the Law-giver, there can be no danger from hostility where the Son of God is the Defender. The

† Οὗτοι πα-
λαιαὶ ἐκεί-
νοι. We find
not these
words in the
Nicene Creed,
as it was in it
self before the
additions at
Constantino-
ple. But not
long after,
S. Cyril ex-
pounds them in
his Catechism,
and Epiphani-
us in Anco-
ratio repeating
two severall
Creeds, a short-
er and a long-
er, §. 120,
and 121. hath
these words in
boith. After
this they were
added expressly
in the Constan-
tinopolitan

Creed. And the reason of their insertion without question was that which S. Cyril insinuates in his explanation, that is, the Heresie which was then newly begun. Καὶ πάλιν ἡρώδης λέγειν(Θ), ὅτι τὰς ἐξῆς ἡ Χερσὶ βασιλεία, μόνον τιμω αἰσάνη, τίς δ' οὐκ οἴεται ἐστίν· ἀλλὰ κεκαλῖντο σφραγίστας ἀπὸ τῶν Γαλατικῶν ἀναρροήσαντες ἀπὸ μμοσεύετης, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῆς Χερσὶ καὶ βασιλείας· καὶ ἐπολύμαται εἶναι; ὅτι ὁ Δόγμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξελθὼν, ὥστε οἱ Πατέρες παλιν ἀναλοοῦντες κἀκεῖ ἐστὶ Catech. 15. This was the particular Heresie of Marcellus Bishop of Anagyr, followed by Photius here in the same place, and therefore termed by S. Cyril αὐτὴν τῶν Γαλατικῶν ἀναρροήσαντες. It consisted of two parts; first, that the Kingdome of Christ did wholly cease at the end of this world secondly, that the Word was resolved again into the Father, and consequently did not onely cease to reign, but also cease to exist, Which is yet more plainly expressed by Eusebius in his second Book against Marcellus, Καὶ πάλιν πτότον ἀβρόχως παυδιώσασθαι μετὰ τὸν τῆς κρείστον χειρὶν· τὸ μὲν Λόγον ἑνωμένον τῷ Θεῷ, αἵ μὲν ἐπεὶ ἔργων εἶναι πάλιν τῷ Θεῷ· τῆς δ' ὑμεῖς ἱράκη καταλήθησθεσθαιμιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου, αἵ μὲν πάλιν ὑμῖν τῷ Θεῷ ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ, κἀκεῖ τὸ ὑμῖν τὸ ἀνέστηναι, ὃν ἀνεστήκει. This Heresie of Marcellus S. Basil properly calls an impiety, ἐπεὶ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Epist. 78. and again Epist. 52. εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὑπαρξίαν τῆς τοῦ μονοθεοῦ θεότητος· which he there more fully expresseth, “Ος (Μαρκελλῶν) Λόγον μὲν εἰρήνην τὸν Μονοθεῷ διδοῖς, καὶ χρεῖαν καὶ ὄχι καμψὺ περριζώματα, πάλιν γὰρ εἰς τὸν ὄντα ἐξῆλθε ἡ πανταρχία, ὅτε αὐτὸς τῆς ἐξόδου εἴναι· τίς μετὰ τὸν ἰσχυρόν ἐστιν αἰώνιος. This existence of the Word and the Kingdome of the Son that Heresie made corall; beginning when the Word came from the Father, that is, at the Incarnation, and ending when the Word returned into the Father, that is, at the day of judgement. Which is manifestly delivered by the Eastern Bishops in that Profession of Faith which they sent to those in Italy, “Αλλ’ ἐπειδὴ Χριστός αὐτὸν γενόμενος καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ ἧς τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως, αὐτὴς τῆς παρθένου Κάρυας ἀνέκυρτος, αὐτὸν περικειμένην ἔλεον ἡμῶν. “Εμὲ πάλιν γάρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἔργων αὐτοῦ θέλωσι, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἔξεν αὐτὴν μετὰ τὸν Κωσταντίνου καὶ κρείστον. Τοῖσδε δὲ εἰσι οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκιανῶ καὶ Φωτεινοῦ καὶ Ἀγιοεργαλατῶν, οἱ τὴν προσηγορίαν ὑπαρξίαν τὴν καὶ θεότητα τῆς Χερσὶ, καὶ τὴν ἀπλότησιν αὐτῆς βασιλείαν ἀπέτιστοι, ἵνα-τίς δοκέει τὴν μεταστάσιν, Socrat. l. 2. c. 19. But although Marcellus did thus teach the Kingdome of Christ not to be eternall, yet his Heresie did not so much confist in the denyall of this eternality, as of the substance and person of our Saviour: for otherwise he did truly teach that Christ was an eternall King; As appeareth out of his own words in his book against Asterius the Arian, cited by Eusebius, Οἰκοῦν δεῖν τινα δοκεῖν ἔχειν ἢ καὶ ἀποστόλους αὐτῶν οἰκονομία τὴν καὶ βασιλείαν. ἕθεν γὰρ ὑπερηβάτως ἢ πῶτο τοῦ ὑποδὸς Ἀποστόλου ῤάδην, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἱεροῦς αὐτῶν ὑπογράσειον τῆς ποδῶν αὐτῶν· ἵνα οὗτοι ἐπειδὴ τὸς ἱεροῦς καὶ ἀποστόλων τῆς ποδῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς Χερσὶ τῆς ἐκ μέρους ταύτης βασιλείας πάντων καὶ καθόλης βασιλείας ἀσφαρίζον. And therefore he made the same confession with the Catholics when he delivered an account of his Faith to Iulius Bishop of Rome, Πιστεύω τὸ ἰσχύον· τὰς θείας γεγραπτάς, ὅτι εἰς Θεός, καὶ ὁπότε μονοφυσίς αὐτὸς Λόγος· ὁ αὐτὸς Κοσμοποιὸς τῶν Πατέρων καὶ μητροπολίτου ἀρχιερέων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἱεράρχων, ἀλλότως ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀσφαρίζον, καὶ κληθείς, καὶ πιστευθείς, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς αὐτῶν συνθεσπισμένος τῶν Θεῶν καὶ Πατέρων· ὁ τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ τῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων μαρτυρών, καὶ ἱσχυ τῶν Εὐφίων. Epiph. Hæref. 72. f. 2.

† Inimicus eras, eris lub pedibus ejus aut adoptatus aut victus, S. Augustine.

* Βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ δύο εἶδεν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, τὴν μὲν κατ’ οἰκείαν, τὴν δ’ ἐκ δημοκρατίας· βασιλείαν ἑκάστην γὰρ ἀπάντων καὶ Ἑλλάδα καὶ Ἰουδαίαν περιλαμβάνει· τὴν δ’ ἀπὸ δικτατορίας καὶ τῶν τῶν δημοκρατίας λόγων· βασιλείαν τῆς τῆς πτωχῶν καὶ κατώτερων καὶ ὑποτασσόμενων κατὰ τὸν τοῦ οἰκονομίας, S. Chryllog. Hom. . 9. in i ad Corinth.

he be term'd *Almighty*, who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any Agent, no influence of any Cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from the Principal Agent, or the first of Causes.

† There is nothing in the whole circumference of the Universe, but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act; (for nothing can be done without a power to doe it:) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their severall and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite effence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

Secondly, God may be called Omnipotent,* because there can be no resistance made to his power, no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. *a The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?* *b He doeth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what dost thou?* According to the degrees of power in the Agent and the Resistant is an action perform'd or hindered; if there be more degrees of power in the Resistant then the Agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, not wholly hinder'd or suppress'd. But if there be no degree of power in the Resistant in reference to the Agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his being above all opposition, to be infinite. As Jehosaphat said, *c In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?* From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any things; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest then the least of creatures; but an equall facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be † imagined but by an infinite excessse of power above and beyond all resistance.

Thirdly, God is yet more properly called Omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth it self to * all things; neither is there any thing imaginably possible which he cannot do. Thus when God severall wayes had declared his power unto Job, *d Job answered the Lord and said, I know that thou canst doe every thing.* Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively in respect of it's object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced; intensively, in respect of the action, or perfection of the effect produced: for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of Gods omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in it self such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implyeth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implyeth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect

† Ἡ ἀπείρου-
δυνάμειος τις
οὐκ ἐστίν· οὐδὲ
εἰς πᾶσι τὰ ὄντα
χρηστικῶς ἔστιν ἰσχύς· οὐ γὰρ
πᾶσι ἀποφύγει τὸ
ἔχειν πᾶσα δυνά-
μεις, ἀλλ' ἡ νοῦς
ἐστὶν, ἡ λογικὴ, ἡ
ἀνδρῶν, ἡ ζώων
πικρὴν ἢ ὁσίων
δυνάμειν ἔχει.
καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ, εἰ
ἴσῃς· εἰς τὴν τὸ
ἐναντιοῦν αὐτοῦ, εἰς
τὸ ἐναντιοῦν τὰ
ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁσίων
δυνάμειος.

Dionys. Areop.
De Divin.

Nom. cap. 8.

* Neque enim
veraciter ob
aliud vocatur
Omnipotens,
nisi quia
quicquid vult
potest; nec
voluntate cu-
juspiani crea-
turae volun-
tatis omni-
potentis im-
peditur effe-
ctus, S. Aug.
Ench. ad Laur.
cap. 96.

a Isa. 14. 27.

b Dan. 4. 35.

c 2 Chr. 20. 6.

† Nisi omni-
potens esset,
non una ea-
demque faci-
litate summa
atque ima fe-
cisset, Fulgent.

de Fide ad Pe-

trum, cap. 3.

* Quis est o-

mnipotens

nisi qui o-

mnia potest?

S. Aug. de

Trin. l. 4. c. 7.

d Job 42. 1, 2.

effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power: and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either in respect of the Object, or in respect of the Agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction Immediately or Consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in termes doth signifie a repugnancy and so destroys it self, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God † to make that not to have been, which hath already been: but that is no derogation to Gods power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in it self: which is that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequentially contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

That doth imply a Contradiction in respect of the Agent, which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for being every action floweth from the essence of the Agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence, must involve a contradiction as to the Agent. Thus we may say God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot † dye; he cannot sleep whose being is spirituall; he cannot want, whose nature is al sufficient; he cannot dye, who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his Omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity. Thus it is impossible for God to * lye, to whom we say nothing is impossible; and, he who can do all things,

† Τὸ γὰρ ποιεῖν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι ποιεῖν, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἄριστοτ. ἠθικ. Εὐδ. l. 3. c. 2. Quisquis dicit, Si omnipotens est Deus, faciat ut quæ facta sunt facta non fuerint, non vider hoc se dicere, si omnipotens est faciat ut ea quæ vera sunt eo ipso quo vera sunt falsa sint, S. Aug. contra Faustum. l. 26. c. 5. It is granted therefore to be true, which Pliny objects, Deum

non facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui honores gessit, non gesserit; as this proves nothing against omnipotency because it is not act of possibility. Had the Act objected been feasible, and God had not the power to effect it, then had he wanted some power, and consequently had not been Omnipotent. But being it is not want of power in the Agent, but of possibility in the Object, it proveth no deficiency in God. † Neque enim & vitam Dei & præscientiam Dei sub necessitate ponimus si dicamus, Necesse est Deum semper vivere & cuncta præscire, sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori fallique non posse. Sic enim hoc non potest, ut potius, si posset, minoris esset utique potestatis. Recte quippe Omnipotens dicitur qui nec mori & falli non potest. Dicitur enim Omnipotens faciendo quod vult non patiendi quod non vult. Quod si ei accideret, nequaquam esset Omnipotens. Unde propterea quædam non potest quia Omnipotens est, Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 5. c. 10. Nam ego dico quanta non possit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest, quæ si posset non esset Omnipotens, Autor Serm. 119. ad Temp. a Heb. 6. 18. * Nunquid mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur; quia impossibile est mentiri Deum. Impossibile autem istud nunquidam infirmitatis est: Non utique; Nam quomodo omnia potest, si aliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossibile? Illud utique quod naturæ ejus contrarium est, non quod virtute arduum. Impossibile, inquit, est ei mentiri, & impossibile istud non infirmitatis est, sed virtutis & majestatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorem, S. Amb. Annot. in Num. Si volunt invenire quod Omnipotens non potest, habent profus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest. Credamus ergo quod potest non credendo quod non potest, S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 25.

* CANNOT

Thus God is Omnipotent, and God onely. For if the power of all things beside God be the power of God, as derived from him and subordinate unto him, & his own power from whence that is derived can be subordinate to none, then none can be Omnipotent but God.

Again, we say that *God the Father is Almighty*; but then we cannot say that the Father onely is Almighty. For the reason why we say the Father is Almighty, is because he is God; and therefore we cannot say that he † onely is Almighty, because it is not true that he onely is God. Whosoever then is God; hath the same reason and foundation of Omnipotency, which the Father hath, and consequently is to be acknowledged properly and truly Omnipotent as the Father is. But we have already shew'd that the Son of God is truly God, and shall hereafter shew that the Holy Ghost is also God; and that by the same nature by which the Father is God. The Father therefore is *Almighty*, because the Father is God; the Son *Almighty*, because the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost *Almighty*, because the Holy Ghost is God. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God by the same Divinity: therefore the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are Omnipotent by the same Omnipotency. The Father then is not called *Almighty* by way of exclusion, but is here mentioned with that attribute peculiarly, * because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, as being the *right hand of power*. The Father therefore is here described by the notion of *Almighty*, to shew that Christ, having ascended into heaven, and being set down at the *right hand of God*, is invested with a greater power then he exercis'd before: and that power which was then actually conferr'd upon him, acknowledgeth no bounds or limits; but all power in the ultimate extent of it's infinity is given unto him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is *God the Father*; and, being so, is therefore truly and properly *Almighty*.

It is necessary to professe belief in God *Almighty*; First, because the acknowledgment of his Omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission & obedience which is due unto his infinite Majesty. Our God is ^a a great God, a mighty, and a terrible; therefore terrible because mighty. ^b I will forewarn you, saith our Saviour, whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell, I say unto you, fear him. Three times we are commanded to fear, and one onely reason rendred, but sufficient for a thousand fears, the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerfull perswasion to obedience, when he said unto him, ^c I am the Almighty God, walk before me and be thou perfect. It was a rational advice ^{ch} the Apostle giveth us. ^d Humble your selves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time. And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the law of God, to consider that he is the ^e one Lawgiver who is able to save & to destroy.

Secondly, the belief of Gods Omnipotency is absolutely necessary as the foundation of our faith. All the miracles which have been seen, were therefore wrought, that we might believe; and never miracle had been seen, if God were not Omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all naturall and infinite power, and did they not require an infinite activity, an assent unto them would not deserve the name of faith. If God were not *Almighty*, we should be-

† Non ergo quispiam audebit quamlibet creaturam, sive celestem sive terrestrem dicere Omnipotentem, nisi solam Trinitatem, Patrem scilicet & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum. Non enim cum dicimus nos credere in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem sicut hæretici Ariani negamus Filium Omnipotentem, aut Spiritum Sanctum, *Author lib. de Symbolo ad Catechum. l. 2. cap. 3.*

* Nor is it unusual in other Authors to make use of the word Omnipotens, rather in relation to the present occasion, then in reference to the person who is said to be omnipotent; as is observed by Servius upon that verse of Virgil, *Æneid.* 9. Jupiter omnipotens audacibus annue ceptis. Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur, interdum ad causam dicentis. Namque hoc loco dicendo Omnipotens ostendit eum etiam his qui

per se minus valent præstare posse virtutem. ^a Deut. 10. 7. ^b Luke 12. 5. ^c Gen. 17. 1. ^d 1 Pet. 5. 6. ^e 1a. 4. 12.

lieve

† This was the Argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous. Because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the divine power, and the reason of that was because they thought all things possible to God, as we shewed before. Ταυτα τινος δε (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions either fabulous or miraculous) οτι δυνατον ην παντι θεω. And whereas

others looked upon them as weak and simple people, for giving credit to such fabulous relations, οτι ταυτα οτι δυνατον ην παντι θεω. Iamblich. de Vita Pythag. cap. 28.

a Rom. 4. 20, 21.

* Nulla est in promissis Dei falsitas, quia nulla est in faciendis difficultas aut impossibilitas, Fulgent. l. 1. ad Monim.

b 2 Tim. 1. 12.

c Iohn 10. 29.

d Mat. 6. 13.

e Eph. 3. 20.

lieve nothing; but being he is so, † why should we disbelieve any thing? What can God propound unto us, which we cannot assent unto, if we can believe that he is Omnipotent?

Thirdly, it is not onely necessary in matters of bare faith, and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the Father of the faithfull, ^a who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform. The promises of God are therefore ^{*} firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to doe what they have promised, or cannot doe what they intend; in the first we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle, ^b I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. I am assured that if I be a sheep and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darknesse and the gates of hell can never prevail against me: for it was the voice of the Son of God, ^c My Father which gave them me is greater then all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

Lastly, the belief of Gods Omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as if God himself were not Almighty, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of Prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgement, ^d For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory. Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, then that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, ^e who is able to doe exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us.

After this Explication of our Saviour's Session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be suppos'd, to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that Christ is set on the right hand of God the Father Almighty. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our Redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetuall habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his office of Mediator, unto the end of the world, according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

ART I.

ARTICLE VII.

From† thence shall He come to Iudge the quick and the Dead.

THis Article containeth in it four Particular Considerations, and no more; First, that Christ, who is gone from us, shall come again. Secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended; for from thence he shall come. Thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is to judge; for from thence he shall come to judge. Fourthly, that the object of that Action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whither dead before, or then alive; for from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead.

For the illustration of the first Particular two things will be necessary, and no more; first, to shew that the promised Messias was to come again after he once was come: secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already prov'd once to have come as the true Messias) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the Messias was to come again, was not onely certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we were admonished of his coming to suffer: as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy, with the Jews, a double Messias, one the son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error; that the Messias is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and dye, as they conceived of their son of Joseph; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expected the son of David. Particularly, ^a Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied of this Advent, saying, *behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Angels.* And more particularly Daniel saw the Representation of his judiciary power and glory. ^b *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not passe away, and his kingdome that which shall not be destroyed.* This Son of man the ^{*} Jews themselves confesse to be the

† Or, from whence; the Latines sometimes inde, sometimes unde. And the Greek is ὅθεν, unde, both in the ancient MS, in Sir Robert Cottons Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But ἐκθεν ἐπέλαυνον, in the latter MS, in Bennet Colledge Library. Others neither ὅθεν nor ἐκθεν but πάλιν, as Iustine Martyr Ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ἡν οὗτος εὐαγγελιστάς τε, καὶ ἀναστάντας, καὶ ἀνελθόντες εἰς τὸς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ πάλιν παρακλησόμενοι ἐκ τῆς παύσεως ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπορίας ἀνδραγαθῶν πᾶν μᾶλλον αὐτῷ Ἀδελφ. Dial. cum Tryphone. Others without inde or unde, onely venturus, as the Nicene Creed, ἐκ τῆς νεκρῶν ἀνίσταμενοι οὐρανὸν ἄλλοι πάλιν ἐκ τῆς νεκρῶν ἀνίσταμενοι οὐρανὸν πάλιν; and Fortunatus leaving out inde venturus, hath onely judicaturus vivos & mortuos.

^a Jude 14. ^b Dan. 7. 13, 14. ^{*} R. Saadiah Gaon ad locum, "לארני שב נאמ" In Bereshit Rabba, speaking of the Genealogy concluding (1 Chron. 3. 24.) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Elioenai, the Author asks this question, וְיִי רֹא עֲנִי and who is this Anani? and answers it thus, זהו משיח ש' חזוהו ר' חזוהו ליליא ואר' עב ענני שמיא בכר אנש אחרי הוה: This is the Messias, as it is written, Dan. 7. 13. I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with Anani, that is, the clouds of heaven; Solomon Iarchi ad locum, אנש הוא מלך המשיח, and Aben-Ezra ibidem, אמר רב יוחנן כי זהו משיח. בכר אנש אחרי הוה: So the Author of Tzeror Hammor, אמר רב הורא מור המשיח כאומר בכר אנש אחרי הוה: The mytery of man is the mytery of the Messias, according to that of Daniel, he came as the Son of man. This place is mentioned for one of the which speak of the Messias, in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 2. And the Midrash upon the 21. Psal. v. 7. אמר רב יוחנן כי זהו משיח שמיא בכר אנש: speaking of the Messias. Indeed the Jews do so generally interpret this place of Daniel of the Messias, that they make it an Argument to prove that the Messias is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven.

S f

promised

† This was the argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous. Because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the divine power, and the reason of that was because they thought all things possible to God, as we shewed before. Τὰς τινὰς δὲ (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions either fabulous or miraculous) οὐ δύνασθαι πιστεῖν ἁπλοῦς ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀποδεχόμεθα, ὅτι αἱ εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀναγόμεναι. And whereas others looked upon them as weak and simple people, for giving credence to such fabulous relations, αὐτοὶ μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀποδεχόμενοι, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀποδεχόμεθα, Iamblich. de Vita Pythag. cap. 28.

a Rom. 4. 20, 21.

* Nulla est in promissis Dei falsitas, quia nulla est in faciendis difficultas aut impossibilitas, Fulgent. l. 1. ad Monim.

b 1 Tim. 1. 12.

c John 10. 29.

d Mat. 6. 13.

e Eph. 3. 20.

lieve nothing; but being he is so, † why should we disbelieve any thing? What can God propound unto us, which we cannot assent unto, if we can believe that he is Omnipotent?

Thirdly, it is not onely necessary in matters of bare faith, and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the Father of the faithfull, ^a who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform. The promises of God are therefore ^{*} firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to doe what they have promised, or cannot doe what they intend; in the first we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle, ^b I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. I am assured that if I be a sheep and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darknesse and the gates of hell can never prevail against me: for it was the voice of the Son of God, ^c My Father which gave them me is greater then all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

Lastly, the belief of Gods Omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as if God himself were not Almighty, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of Prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgement, ^d For thine is the Kingdome, the Power, and the Glory. Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, then that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, ^e who is able to doe exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us.

After this Explication of our Saviour's Session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be suppos'd, to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that Christ is set on the right hand of God the Father Almighty. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our Redemtion, did rest in everlasting happinesse; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetuall habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his office of Mediator, unto the end of the world, according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

ART I.

ARTICLE VII.

From † thence shall He come to ludge the quick and the Dead.

THis Article containeth in it four Particular Considerations, and no more; First, that Christ, who is gone from us, shall come again. Secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended: for from thence he shall come. Thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is to judge; for from thence he shall come to judge. Fourthly, that the object of that Action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whither dead before, or then alive; for from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead.

For the illustration of the first Particular two things will be necessary, and no more; first, to shew that the promised Messias was to come again after he once was come: secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already prov'd once to have come as the true Messias) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the Messias was to come again, was not onely certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we were admonished of his coming to suffer: as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy, with the Jews, a double Messias, one the son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error; that the Messias is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and dye, as they conceived of their son of Joseph; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of David. Particularly, ^a Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied of this Advent, saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Angels. And more particularly Daniel saw the Representation of his judiciary power and glory. ^b I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not passe away, and his kingdome that which shall not be destroyed. This Son of man the ^{*} Jews themselves confesse to be the

† Or, from whence; the Latines sometimes inde, sometimes unde. And the Greek is ὅθεν, unde, both in the ancient MS, in Sir Robert Cottons Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But ὅθεν nor ὅθεν, in the latter Ms, in Bennet Colledge Library. Others neither ὅθεν nor ὅθεν, but παρὶν, as Justine Martyr Ἡμεῖς ἐνὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐρανῶν, καὶ ἀναστῆναι, καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ παρὶν παρακλησάμενοις καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ἀπαλαῖς ἀνδράσι πονηχοῦς ἀντιτάξαι. Dial. cum Tryphone. Others without inde or unde, onely venturus, as the Nicene Creed, ἰσχυροῦ καὶ βίβαν others παρὶν ἰσχυροῦ, or ὅθεν, καὶ παρὶν; and Fortunatus leaving out inde venturus, hath onely judicaturus vivos & mortuos.

^a Jude 14. ^b Dan. 7. 13, 14. ^{*} R. Saadias Gaon ad locum: "לאני שב לימני: וזו משיח צדקת כרחוק נאם ה' לאני שב לימני: In Bereshit Rabba, speaking of the Genealogy concluding (1 Chron. 3. 24.) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Elioenai, the Author asks this question, ומי הוא ענני, and who is this Anani? and answers it thus, זהו: This is the Messias, as it is written, Dan. 7. 13. I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with Anani, that is, the clouds of heaven; Solomon Tarchi ad locum, and Aben-Ezra ibidem, אמר רב ירמיה כי זה, וזו ארם הוא סוד המשיח כבודו כבוד אנו: So the Author of Tzeror Hammor: The mystery of man is the mystery of the Messias, according to that of Daniel, he came as the Son of man. This place is mentioned for one of the which speak of the Messias, in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 2. And the Midrash upon the 21. Psal. v. 7. אמר ענני שמיא כבוד אנו: speaking of the Messias. Indeed the Jews do so generally interpret this place of Daniel of the Messias, that they make it an Argument to prove that the Messias is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven.

† This Interpretation is delivered in libro Sanhedrim, אר' אלכסנדר' כתב על מלך המשיח ואר' ענני שמאי כבר אנוס אחריה הוא וכתב עני ורובב על המור זכר עני שמאי לא זכר עני ורובב על המור:

Idem etiam legitur in Bereshit Rabba R. Moseh Hadirshan, Gen. 49. 11. Thus they make the coming of Christ to depend upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messias are absolute and irrespective, depending only on the goodness of God, not to be evacuated or altered by the wickedness of man. Nay the unworthiness of the Jews which Christ found when he came in humility, is one special cause why he should come again in glory.

a Acts 1. 11.

b Iohn 14. 3.

28.

c Gen. 49. 19.

d Heb. 10. 37. ויפגועו בך, that is, he who is known by that vulgar appellation ויפגועו, he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore will come again. This was it which made the Apostles ask that Question, Matth. 24. 3. When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? e Mat. 16. 28. f Revelat. 1. 7. † As R. Saadiah Gaon upon that place of Daniel 7. 13. ענני השמים מלאכי צבא. The clouds of heaven they are the Angels of the host of heaven; this is the great magnificence and power which God shall give unto the Messias. From hence is that exposition in Midrash Tillim, Psal. 21. 7. אר' ברביה בשם ר' שמוראל כתוב אחרי אומ' ואר' עני שמאי כבר אנוס אחריה הוא וכתב עני ורובב אמר וקרבתי ונניש אליה הא כיצד המלאכין מבינים אותו ער מחיצות: Rabbi Barachia said in the name of Rabbi Samuel, One Scripture saith (Dan. 7. 13.) And behold one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him near before him. And another Scripture saith, (Jerem. 30. 21.) and I will cause him to draw near and he shall approach unto me. Behold in what manner? The Angels shall bring him into the midst of them.

promised Messias, and they take the words to signifie his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth; but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying that † if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messias should come in humility, according to the description in Zachary, *lowly and riding upon an asse*; but if they pleased God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the prophet Daniel *with the clouds of heaven*. Whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfill'd. From whence it followeth, that, being Christ is already come *lowly and sitting upon an asse*, therefore hereafter he shall come gloriously *with the clouds of heaven*. For if both those descriptions cannot belong to one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally propheticall; then must there be a double advent of the same Messias, and so his second coming was foretold.

That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true Messias, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the Angels, ^a *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him goe into heaven*. We have the promise of Christ himself to his Apostles, ^b *If I goe to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto my self: ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you*. He it is which from the beginning was to come; that expresse prophesie so represented him, ^c *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come*; the name of *Shiloh* was obscure, but the notion of the *comer*, added to it, was most vulgar. According to this notion once Christ came, and being gone he keeps that notion still; he is to come again. ^d *For yet a little while and he that shall come will come*. Our Jesus then shall come, and not onely so, but shall so come, as the Messias was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as the ^e *Son of man coming in his Kingdom*. This was expresse in the propheticall vision by coming *with clouds*, and in the same manner shall our Jesus come; For ^f *Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him*. Those clouds were anciently expounded by the [†] Jews of the glorious attendance of the Angels, waiting upon the Son of man: and in the same manner, with the same attendance doe we expect the coming of our Jesus, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, ^g *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels*. And thus our Jesus as the true Messias shall come again, which was our first Consideration.

The

The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the Creed by reflection upon the place whither he went when he departed from us; For *he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, and from thence shall he come*: that is, from, and out of the highest heaven (where he now sitteth at the right hand of God) shall Christ hereafter come to judge both the quick and the dead. For ^a *him must the heaven receive till the time of* ^{a Acts 3. 21.} *the restitution of all things*; and when that time is fulfill'd, from that heaven shall he come; ^b *For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven* ^{b 1 Thes. 4. 16.} *with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel & with the trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, because from thence we look for our Saviour the Lord Jesus.* Our High Priest is gone up into the Holy of holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us; therefore as the people of Israel stood without the Tabernacle expecting the return of Aaron; so must we look unto the heavens and expect Christ from thence; ^c *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven* ^{c 2 Thes. 1. 7.} *with his mighty Angels.* Wo do believe that Christ is set down on the right hand of God; but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there: and to that purpose Christ himself hath joyned them together, saying, ^d *Hereafter shall ye see the* ^{d Mat. 26. 64.} *Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* Thus shall the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of power, in fulnesse of Majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity: that by an undoubted authority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead: which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging. *From whence shall he come to judge.*

For the explication of this Action, as it stands in this Article, three considerations will be necessary. First, how we may be assured that there is a Judgement to come, that any one *shall come to judge.* Secondly, in case we be assured that there shall be a Judgement, how it appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is, that Christ shall be the Judge. Thirdly, in case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that Christ shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgement shall consist, how this action shall be performed: and more then this cannot be necessary to make us understand, that *he shall come to judge.*

That there is a Judgement to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whither we consider our selves who are to undergoe it, or God who is to execute it. If we doe but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence, that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgement hereafter is to passe upon us. There is in the soul of every man a Conscience, and wheresoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to doe, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them; and if it did no more, it would onely prove that there is a judgement in this life, and every man his own Judge. But being it doth not onely allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; being it doth not onely disprove and condemn

our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearfull expectation and terrour in us; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life: it followeth, that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witnesse, bound over to give testimony, for or against us at some judgement after this life to passe upon us. For all men are *e a Law unto themselves*, and have *the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.*

Again, if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us; whither we look upon him in himself, or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgement from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, *f so that a man shall say, verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.* Now the same God who is our Judge, is, by an attribute, necessary and inseparable, Just; and this Justice is so essential to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be Just. It was a rationall expostulation which Abraham made, *g shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* we may therefore infallibly conclude that God is a most just Judge; and if he be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of an universal Justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable, as if they were punished for their inno- cency. Nothing more certain then that in this life, rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins of men. Which consideration will inforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no judge of the Actions of mankind, or if there be a judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or punishments; or lastly, if there be a Judge, and that Judge be just, then is there a judgement in another world, and the effects thereof concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge which judgeth the earth, being we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confesse that God is most just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgement yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosome carry an undeniable witnesse of all his actions.

From hence the Heathen, having alwayes had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man, and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a judgement to come. Insomuch that when S. Paul *reasoned of righteousness and temperance and judgement to come, Felix trembled.* The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a preconception which he had of judgement after death, now heightened by the Apostles particular description, created an horroir in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same Apostle discoursing to the Athenians, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this Article of

Heb. 6. 2.

throne hath been already seen, the Judge hath appeared sitting on it; the books have been already open'd, the dead small and great have been seen standing before him: there is nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamental, then that of *eternal Judgement*. I shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from the essential attribute, the justice, of God, from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this, and in relation to another life, there is a Judgement to come, there *shall* some person *come to judge*.

Heb. 12. 23.
Eccles. 12. 14.
Rom 2. 5.

Our second consideration followeth; (seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgement,) who that person is which *shall come to judge*, who shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the Judiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discussed were due to him, the persons which are to be tryed are subject to his dominion; God therefore is the Judge of all. He shall bring every work into judgement with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil; and so the last day, that day of wrath is the revelation of the righteous judgement of God. Now if God, as God, be the Judge of all, then whosoever is God is judge of all men, and therefore being we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost to be God, it followeth that the † Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost shall judge the world; because the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in respect of the same divinity have the same autocratorical power, dominion, and authority.

† Πατρις υἱος
καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος
ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ
πατρὸς ἐκγονοί
καὶ ἀδελφοί
ἐκ τῆς δόξης
ἐκκλησιαστικῆς
S. Cyril Ca-
tech. 15.

Act. 17. 31.

John 5. 22.

John 5. 27.

But notwithstanding in that particular day of the generall judgement to come, the execution of this Judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by him. For God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained. It is God who judgeth, it is Christ by whom he judgeth. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son. There is therefore an original, supreme, autocratorical judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost: Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For the Father hath given him authority to execute judgements, because he is the Son of man; not simply because he is a man, therefore he shall be judge, (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should only judge,) but because of the three persons which are God; he only is † also the Son of man, and therefore

† This English-
tion I thought
necessary to in-
sert,

because it seems to me the only way to end that controversy which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of S. Iohn which we ordinarily read thus, 27. Καὶ ἐκείνου ἐστὶν ὁ κρίνων τὸν κόσμον ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. By which distinction those words because he is the Son of man have reference to the precedent sentence. But anciently they have been otherwise distinguished, Καὶ ἐκείνου ἐστὶν ὁ κρίνων τὸν κόσμον ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. Ὁν υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ὁ κρίνων τὸν κόσμον. So the old Syriack Translation, vers. 27. ואשכנח ונתת עבר אף. וברך הו דין ראשא לא חתרתון כדא. And S. Chrysostome is so earnest for this for

reading, that he chargeth the former distinction upon Paulus Samosatensis, as invented by him in favour of his Heresie, that Christ was nothing else but purely man. "Οτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ μὴ θαυμάσιος τὸτο, Παῦλος μὲν ὁ Σαμοσατικός ἐκ ἄπο φησὶν, ἀλλὰ πῶς; Ἐκείναις ἰδοὺς αὐτὸς κρίσει ποιεῖν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖθεν ἀποκρίθαι ἔχει τὸτο λεγόμενον (so he argues against that reading) ἢ γὰρ διὰ τὸτο ἔλαβεν κρίσει ὅτι ἀνθρώπος ἐστίν (ἵνα π' ἐκείνου πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰσακρίται;) ἀλλ' ἰπιδὸν τὴν ἀρίστην κρίσιν ἐκείνου ἰδὴν υἱὸς διὰ τὸτο καὶ κριτικὸς ἐστίν. Οὕτως οὖν ἀναγνώσκειν, "Οτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ μὴ θαυμάσιος τὸτο. Euthymius followeth the distinction of S. Chrysostome, and Theophylact makes the same Argument, Χρὶς ὁ μόνος ἐστὶν ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατικός φησὶν ἀνθρώπου δογματίζον ὃ Κόρεον ἔπος ἀνθρώπου τὸτο πρῶτον. Καὶ ἐκείναις ἰδοὺς αὐτὸς καὶ κρίσει ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ" εἰπάμεν ὃ εἶπον αἱ ἄλλαι ἀνὰ ἀνθρώπου τὸ, Μὴ θαυμάσιος τὸτο. Ἀντίκειναι ὃ τελείωσιν τὸ ἔπος ἀναγνώσκων, τὴν γὰρ κρίσιν τῆς υἱὸς ὁ Παῦλος ἰδοὺς, ἐκ ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Οὗτος. But though this division of the words be both by S. Chrysostome and Theophylact charged upon Paulus Samosatensis the Heretick, yet we find no other distinction in the ancient copies; nor did the Ancient Latine Fathers any otherwise read it then that Paulus did. We must then acknowledge no other coherence then the ordinary, that God gave his Son power to judge because he was the Son of man. Nor need we to avoid the Argument of S. Chrysostome, change the ὅτι into quatenus, the quia into quatenus, for it is not rendered as the absolute reason in it self, but in relation unto God, or the persons of the Trinity; the Father shall not judge, nor the Holy Ghost, because those two persons are only God, but all judgement is committed to God the Son because he is the Son of man.

for his affinity with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest mildnesse and sweetnesse of equity in the severity of that just and ir-respective judgement.

Nor was this a reason onely in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look onely upon his being the Son of man, but also upon what he did and suffer'd as the Son of man. He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature, in that nature so taken he humbled himself to all the infirmities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which this life could bring, to all the pains and sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause; and therefore in regard of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of the exaltations due unto him was this power of judging. *The Father* therefore, who is onely *John 5: 22, 23: 27.* God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or Angels, judgeth no man; (and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost) but hath committed all judgement to the Son; and the reason why he hath committed it to him, is because he is, not onely the Son of God, and so truly God, but also the Son of man, and so truly man; because he is that Son of man, who suffered so much for the Sons of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not onely that it is a certain truth that Christ shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God so highly to reward that Son of man, as to make him Judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemn'd to dye, and dyed that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to stand before the Tribunal and receive that sentence, let him be crucified; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ

veniet Christus ut iudex qui stetit sub iudice: veniet

in ea forma in qua iudicatus est, ut videant in quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Iudæi quam negaverunt, convincat eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus, *Author lib. de Symb. ad Carech. lib. I. cap. 4.* Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet ille; qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. Ille qui iudicatus est veniet iudicaturus. Ille qui stetit ante hominem iudicaturus est omnem hominem, *idem l. 2. c. 8.* Iudex hic erit filius hominis; forma illa hic iudicabit quæ iudicata est. Audite & intelligite, jam hoc Propheta dixerat, *Videbunt in quem pupugerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Iudex qui stetit sub iudice. Damnabit veros reos qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet; forma illa veniet, *S. Aug. de Verbis Dom. Serm. 64.*

him.

and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaffe with unquenchable fire. The Son of man describes himself as an householder saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, *Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn: and this harvest is the end of the world.* He representeth himself under the notion of a Fisherman ^a casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full, he drew to the shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. He is the Bridegroom who took the wise virgins ^b with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish. He is the man who travelling into a far country, delivered the talents to his servants, and ^c after a long time cometh again, and reckoneth with them, exalting the good and faithful, and casting the unprofitable servant into utter darknesse. Lastly, he is the Shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to this judgement. For ^d when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a Shepherd his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left. Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man, as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime from the chaffe, sometime from the tares: as a Fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a Bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins; as a Master distinguishing the servants of his family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable; as a shepherd, dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the same Son of man is appointed the Judge of all the Sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge, which is the second consideration subservient to the present Explication.

Thirdly, it being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this Judgement be; in what that Judicall action doth consist; what he shall then doe; when he shall come to judge. The reality of this Act doth certainly consist in the finall determination, and actuall disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternall condition: and in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not so [†] certain unto us; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary processe. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunall, a judgement-seat; for ^e in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory: and that this throne is a seat not onely of Majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, *ye also shall sit upon the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* As in that vision in the Revelation, ^f I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgement was given unto them. And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgement-seat, when the Apostles tell us, ^g we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ, and ^h we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ. In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a throne of

Mat. 13. 30, 39

Πάλιν ἀγαμέμνους αὐτὸς ἔσθ

ἰσθῆναι ῥησάν

των ἰσθῆναι ῥησάν

αὐτὸς εἰσθῆναι

τῶν S. Chrys.

ad locum.

a Mat. 13. 47.

48.

b Mat. 25. 10.

c Mat. 25. 19.

21. 30.

d Mat. 25. 31.

32. 33.

e Mat. 25. 31.

32. 33.

f Revel. 4. 4.

g 1. Cor. 4. 5.

h 2. Cor. 5. 10.

i 1. Tim. 4. 8.

j 2. Tim. 4. 8.

k 1. Pet. 4. 5.

l 2. Pet. 2. 12.

m 1. Pet. 4. 5.

n 2. Pet. 2. 12.

o 1. Pet. 4. 5.

p 2. Pet. 2. 12.

q 1. Pet. 4. 5.

r 2. Pet. 2. 12.

s 1. Pet. 4. 5.

t 2. Pet. 2. 12.

u 1. Pet. 4. 5.

v 2. Pet. 2. 12.

w 1. Pet. 4. 5.

x 2. Pet. 2. 12.

y 1. Pet. 4. 5.

z 2. Pet. 2. 12.

aa 1. Pet. 4. 5.

ab 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ac 1. Pet. 4. 5.

ad 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ae 1. Pet. 4. 5.

af 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ag 1. Pet. 4. 5.

ah 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ai 1. Pet. 4. 5.

aj 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ak 1. Pet. 4. 5.

al 2. Pet. 2. 12.

am 1. Pet. 4. 5.

an 2. Pet. 2. 12.

ao 1. Pet. 4. 5.

ap 2. Pet. 2. 12.

aq 1. Pet. 4. 5.

ar 2. Pet. 2. 12.

Mat. 26. 64.

himself did shew at the same time when he stood before the judgement seat, saying, *Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*

Again, if we look upon our selves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather then him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of Israel could not bear the presence of God as a Law-giver, but desired to receive the law by the hand of Moses; how should we appear before the presence of that God judging us for the breach of that Law, were it not for a better Mediator, of the same nature that Moses was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodnesse of God, that making a generall Judgement, he will make a visible Judge, which all may see who shall be judged. *Without holinesse no man shall ever see God,* and therefore if God, as onely God, should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly † should never see their Judge. But that both the righteous & unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, Christ who is both God and man is appointed Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they onely shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God, and the Son of man, he which was born of the Virgin Mary, he which suffered under Pontius Pilate, he which was crucified, dead and buried, and descended into hell, he which rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of God; He, the same person, in the same nature, a shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his Angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. He then which is to come is the Son of man, and when he cometh, it is to judge. b The same Jesus which was taken up from the Apostles into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him goe into heaven. That Son of man then which is to judge, is our Jesus, even the same Jesus, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead. He then which ascended into heaven was the same which was raised from the dead, and by that Resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. d For to this end Christ both dyed and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. It appeareth therefore by Gods determination, by Christs Resurrection and Ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

This Office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by severall figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist, representeth him that cometh after him by this delineation of an husbandman, *Whose fanne is in his hand, & he will thoroughly purge his floore,*

† Cum boni & mali visuri sunt judicem vivorum & mortuorum, proculdubio eum videre non poterunt mali, nisi secundū formam qua filius hominis est; sed tamen in claritate in qua judicabit, non in humilitate in qua judicatus est. Cæterum illā Dei formam in qua æqualis est Patri proculdubio impii non videbunt. Non enim sunt mundicordes, Beati enim mundicordes, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt Deum, S. Aug. de Trin. l. i. c. 13. Hoc rectum erat ut judicandi viderent Judicem. Judicandi autem erant boni & mali. Beati enim mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt. Resabat ut in iudicio forma servi & bonis & malis ostenderetur, forma Dei solis bonis servaretur, Idem De Verbis Dom. Serm. 64. Et potestatem dedit ei iudicium facere quia filius hominis est. Puto nihil esse manifestius. Nam quia Filius Dei est æqualis Patri, non accepit hanc potestatem iudicii faciendi, sed habet illam cum Patre in occulto. Accepit autem illam ut boni & mali eum videant judicantem, quia filius hominis est. Visio quippe Filii hominis exhibebitur & malis. Nam visio formæ Dei non nisi mundis corde, quia ipsi Deum videbunt, id est, solis piis exhibebitur, quorum dilectioni hoc ipsum promittit quia seipsum ostendit illis, Idem rursus de Trin. l. i. c. 13. a Mat. 16. 27. b Act. 10. 11. c Act. 17. 31. d Rom. 14. 9. e Matth. 3. 12. Ἀντίστοιχον τῷ τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ἐν, εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων, ὡς τῶν ἁγίων, ὡς τῶν ἁγίων, ὡς τῶν ἁγίων, S. Chrys. in loc.

and

and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaffe with unquenchable fire. The Son of man describes himself as an householder saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn: and this harvest is the end of the world. He representeth himself under the notion of a Fisherman ^a casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full, he drew to the shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. He is the Bridegroom who took the wise virgins ^b with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish. He is the man who travelling into a far country, delivered the talents to his servants, and ^c after a long time cometh again, and reckoneth with them, exalting the good and faithfull, and casting the unprofitable servant into utter darkness. Lastly, he is the Shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to this judgement. For ^d when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a Shepherd his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left. Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man, as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime from the chaffe, sometime from the tares: as a Fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a Bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins; as a Master distinguishing the servants of his family, rewarding the faithfull, punishing the unprofitable; as a shepherd, dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the same Son of man is appointed the Judge of all the Sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge, which is the second consideration subservient to the present Explication.

Thirdly, it being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this Judgement be; in what that Judicial action doth consist; what he shall then doe; when he shall come to judge. The reality of this A & doth certainly consist in the final determination, and aſſual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternall condition: and in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not so [†] certain unto us; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary proceſſe. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunall, a judgement-seat; for ^e in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory: and that this throne is a seat not onely of Majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, ye also shall sit upon the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. As in that vision in the Revelation, ^f I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgement was given unto them. And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it; from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgement-seat, when the Apostles tell us, ^g we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ, and ^h we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ. In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a throne of

Mat. 13.30, 39

Πάρις ἀναμύ-

νιστος αὐτὸς τῶ

Ιωάννη πηδ-

ντος ἡν ἔκειτο

αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν

τῶν. S. Chrys.

ad locum.

a Mat. 13.47,

48.

b Mat. 25. 10.

c Mat. 25. 19,

21, 30.

d Mat. 25. 31,

32, 33.

† S. Austin speaking of the particulars.

foretold to be exhibited at the day of Judgement,

concludes them

in this man-

ner, Quæ o-

mnia quidem

ventura esse

credendum

est; sed qui-

bus modis &

quo ordine

veniant ma-

gis tunc do-

cebit rerum

experientia

quam nunc

valet conse-

qui ad perfe-

ctum homi-

num intelli-

gentia, De Ci-

vitate Dei. l. 2.

cap. 30.

e Mat. 19. 28.

f Revel. 20.

g 1. 1.

h Rom. 14. 10.

i 2. Cor. 5. 10.

T t

judi-

Rev. 10. 12.

Mat. 25. 32.

Mat. 24. 31.

2 Thess. 2. 1.

1 Cor. 4. 5.

Eccl. 12. 14.

Rev. 20. 12.

* Dominus
non accepta
persona judi-
cat mundum;
unusquisque
secundum
quæ facit ac-
cipiet. Si fue-
rit bonus, bo-
nitas eum an-
tecedit; si ne-
quam, merces
nequitie
eum sequi-
tur. Epist.
Barthol. 6. 3.
a Mat. 24. 34.
† 41.
‡ 46.

1 Th. 10. 42.

1 Pet. 4. 5.

2 Tim. 4. 1.

† 50 Theophy.

last resisteth.

m. 3. 1. 1.

first Interpretation.

Sicut in xpo resistit.

Epist. 22. lib. 1.

judicature. Secondly, there is to be a personall appearance of all men before that seat of judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for *we must all appear*, and *we shall all stand before that judgement seat*. I saw the dead, saith the Apostle, *stand before the throne of God*. Thus all nations shall be gathered before him. He shall send his Angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. For the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him. Thirdly, when those which are to be judged are brought before the judgement seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear: he will bring to light the hidden things of darknesse, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: he will bring every work into judgement with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. To this end in the vision of Daniel, when the judgement was set, the books were opened; and in that of S. John, the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works. Fourthly, after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a * definitive sentence passed upon all their persons according to those actions which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgement; the sentence of absolution, in these words expressed, *Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the Kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; the sentence of condemnation, in this manner, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels*. Lastly, after the promulgation of the sentence followeth the execution. As it is written, *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal*. Thus appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne, his authority by convening all before him, his knowledge and wisdom by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations, his justice in condemning sinners, his mercy in absolving believers, his power in the execution of his sentence. And thus the Son of man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third Consideration of this Article.

The fourth and last consideration is what is the object of this Action, who are the persons which shall appear before that Judge, and receive their sentence from him, what is the latitude of that expression, *the quick and the dead*. The phrase it self is delivered several times in the Scriptures, and that upon the same occasions for Christ was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead; and so his commission extendeth to both: he is ready to judge the quick and the dead; his resolution reacheth to each: and as he is ordained and ready, so shall he judge the quick and the dead; the execution excludeth neither. But although it be the Scripture language, and therefore certainly true; yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident.

The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in severall notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of several interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body onely remaineth dead; therefore some have understood the souls of men by the quick, and

their

their bodies by *the dead*: and then the meaning will be this, that Christ shall come to judge immediately upon the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joyned to the bodies which were once dead; and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul, for all those actions which the soul committed in the body. Now though this be a truth, that men shall be judged when their souls and bodies are united; though they shall be judged according to those works which their souls have acted in their bodies; yet this is not to be acknowledged as the interpretation of this Article, for two reasons; first, because it is not certain that all men shall dye, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

Again, because the Scripture often mentioneth a death in trespasses and sins, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by the *quick* to be understood the just, and by the *dead* the unjust: so that Christ shall judge the *quick*, that is the just, by a sentence of absolution, and the *dead*, that is the unjust, by a sentence of condemnation. But, though the dead be sometimes taken for sinners, and the living for the righteous, though it be true that Christ shall judge them both; yet it is not probable that in this particular they should be taken in a figurative or metaphorical sense, because there is no adjunct giving any such intimation and because the literal sense affordeth a fair explication; further yet, because the Scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corporeal death, * *Whether we live or die, saith the Apostle, we are the Lords: for to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

Thirdly therefore by *the dead* are understood all those who ever died before the time of Christs coming to judgement, and by *the quick* such as shall be then alive : so that the quick and the dead literally taken are considered in relation to the time of Christs co-

† This is the second exposition delivered by Isidorus Pelusiota to such as are not satisfied with the first, Εἰς καὶ ἀλλας ἐκτίτει, ἔτι διακρίματα, ζωντας τὰς ἀειζώνων βίαι καὶ θεοφιλῆ μετὰ διόλης, καὶ ἐπὶ δὲ δὲ θεῶν αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀμειβάται, κρῖναι τὴν περὶ διόλης τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι καὶ τὸ διδοῖν αὐτοῖς τὰ λαλοῦν ἐν τῷ πορτῇ τῶν εὐστῶν καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

ῥῆσις, καὶ ἀμύναται αὐτοῖς. *Epist. 222. lib. 1. a Rom. 14. 9. * This is the third Exposition of Ἰδοῦναι Πελοῖστα, Εἰδὲ καὶ ἄλλους, ὅπως, κρίναι τὰς τῶτα ζωῆς καταστάσεις, καὶ τὰς ἰδὼν αὐτῶν κακομυήτους, Ἰδίδ. Others of the Fathers give the second and the third explication, leaving it indifferēt, and preferring neither; as S. Chrysost. Ἵτοι ἀμαρτανῶδες λίγην καὶ ὁ θάνατος, Ἵτοι καὶ τὰς ἀποκαθάρσεις καὶ τὰς πάλαι ἔσται καλεῖσθαι τῶν ζῶντων. Com. in 2 Tim. 4. 1. Duobus autem modis accipi potest quod vivos & mortuos judicabit; five ut vivos intelligamus quos hic nōdum, mortuos sed adhuc in ista carne viventes inveniturus est ejus adventus; mortuos autem qui de corpore priusquam veniat exiere vel exiituri sunt : five vivos iustos, mortuos autem iniustos, quoniam iusti quoque judicabuntur, S. Augst. in *Enchirid. c. 54.* Credimus etiam inde venturum convenientissimo tempore, & judicaturum vivos & mortuos, five istis nominibus iusti & peccatores significetur; five quos tunc ante mortem nostram in terris inveniturus est appellari sunt vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resurrecturi sunt, Idem de *Fide & Symb. cap. 8. Inde venturus judicare vivos & mortuos.* Vivos qui superfuerint, mortuos qui præcesserint. Potest & sic intelligi, vivos, iustos; mortuos, iniustos : utrosque enim judicat sua cuncte retribuens. Iustis dominus est in judicio, *Venite benedicti, &c.* Sinistris quid ? *Ite in ignem, &c.* Sic judicabuntur à Christo vivi & mortui. *Author lib. 1. de Symb. ad Catechum.* Duobus modis hæc sententia accipitur. Vivi & mortui in animo, item vivi & mortui in corpore. In corpore secundum priorem, judicabit vivos in anima credentes, & mortuos in anima fidem nullam habentes : secundum posteriorem judicabit vivos in carne, quos præstes invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit & mortuos in carne, quos resuscitaturus est Deus excelsus, *Author lib. 4. de Symb. ad Catech. cap. 7. But although these two Expositions were thus indifferently propounded, yet the former ought by no means so to be received as any way to evinciate or prejudice the later.* Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini vivos & mortuos judicandos, non solum iustos & peccatores significari, sicut Diodorus putat ; sed & vivos eos qui in carne invenienda sunt credimus, qui adhuc morituri creduntur, vel immutandi sunt, ut alii volunt, ut suscitati continuo, vel reformati, cum ante mortuis judicentur, *Germinius de Dogmat. Ecclesiast. cap. 8.**

ruptible, and we, (which shall not sleep) shall be changed; so † that their mutation shall be unto them as a resurrection. And the collation of these two Scriptures maketh up this conclusion so manifestly, that I conceive no man had ever doubted or questioned the truth of it, had they not first differed in the * reading of the Text.

† Nam & in hoc ingemiscimus, domiciliū nostrum quod de cælo est superindui desiderantes,

liquidem exuti & non nudi inveniamur; id est, ante volumus superinduere virtutem cœlestem æternitatis, quam carnē exuamur. Hujus enim gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini deprehenduntur in carne, & propter duritias temporum Antichristi merebuntur compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ concurrere cum resurgentibus, sicut Theſſalonicenſibus ſcribit, *Tertul. de Reſur. Carn. c. 41.* Sancti qui die conſummationis atque judicii in corporibus repiendi ſunt cum aliis ſanctis qui ex mortuis reſurreſcunt ſunt, rapiuntur in nubibus obviam Chriſto in aera, & non guſtabunt mortem; eruntque ſemper cum Domino, graviffima mortis neceſſitate calcata, unde ait Apoſtolus, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur. Theodorus Heracleotes Com. ad loc. apud S. Hieron. Epiſt. 152.* Apollinarius licet aliis verbis eadem quæ Theodorus aſſeruit; quosdam non eſſe morituros, ſed de præſenti vitæ rapiendos in futuram, ut mutatis gloriſicatisque corporibus ſint cum Chriſto, *S. Hieron. ibid.* "Ο ὅλως τὸ πῶς ἔστιν ἡ πάντες μὲν ἀποθανέμεθα, πάντες ἡ ἀναστήμεθα, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἀποθνήσκουσιν· ὅσοι γὰρ καὶ οὐκ. Μὴ τοίνυν, ἰπεὶ οὐδὲν ἀποθνήσκουσιν, διὰ τοῦτο δεῖσιν, ὅτι, ὅς ἐκ ἀναστάσεως ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οἱ καὶ τὸ τοῦ διαφθίσαντος καὶ ὅμως ἐκ ἀπείρου τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐκείνου, ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκείνα τὰ σώματα τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀποθνήσκουσιν, *S. Chrys. ad locum. So S. I. rōme ſpeaking of that place 1 Theſſ. 4.* Hoc ex ipſius loci continentia ſciri poteſt, quod Sancti qui in adventu Salvatoris fuerint deprehenſi in corpore, in iſdem corporibus occurrant ei, ita tamen ut in gloriam & corruptivum & mortale gloria & incorruptione & immortalitate mutetur: ut qualia corpora mortuorum ſurrectura ſunt, in talem ſubſtantiam etiam vivorum corpora transformentur, *S. Hieron. Epiſt. 143. ad Marcellam. And S. Auſtin in relation to the ſame place*, Revera quantum ad verba beati Apoſtoli pertinet, videtur aſſerere quosdam in fine ſæculi, adveniente Domino, cum futura eſt reſurrexio mortuorum, non eſſe morituros, ſed vivos repertos in illam immortalitatem quæ Sanctis etiam cæteris datur, repente mutandos, & ſimul cum illis rapiendos, ſicut dicit, in nubibus. Nec aliquid aliud mihi viſum eſt quoties de his verbis volui cogitare, *S. Aug. ad tertiam Queſt. Dulcitii. Theſe and others of the Ancients have clearly delivered this truth, ſo that Gennadius, notwithstanding his maxima Patrum turba for the contrary, did well confeſs.* Verum quia ſunt & alii æque Catholici & eruditi viſi, qui credunt anima in corpore manente immutandos ad incorruptionem & immortalitatem eos qui in adventu Domini vivi inveniendi ſunt; & hoc eis reputari pro reſurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem præſentis vitæ immutatione deponant, non morte. Quolibet quis acquieſcat modo, non eſt hæreticus, niſi ex contentione hæreticus fiat, *De Ecclēſ. Dogm. cap. 7.* * There have been obſerved three ſeveral readings of that place, *1 Cor. 15. 51.* one of the Latine, two of the Greek. Illud autem breviter in fine commune; hoc, quod in Latinis codicibus legitur, *Omnes quidem reſurgemus, non omnes autem immutabimur*, in Græcis voluminibus non haberi, ſed vel, *Omnes dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*; vel, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*, *S. Hieron. Epiſt. 152.* But there was not one of theſe three only in the Latine Copies, that is the firſt, but one which was in the Greek, was alſo in the Latine, that is the ſecond. For both theſe *S. Auſtin* takes notice of. Nam & illud quod in pluriſque codicibus legitur, *Omnes reſurgemus*, unde fieri poterit, niſi omnes moriamur? Reſurrexio quippe, niſi mors præceſſerit, nulla eſt. Et quod nonnulli codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, multo facilius & apertius id cogit intelligi, *Ad 3. Queſt. Dulcitii.* Sed aliud rursus occurrit quod idem dicit Apoſtolus cum de reſurrectione corporum ad Corinthios loqueretur, *Omnes reſurgemus*, vel, ſicut alii codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, *Idem de Civit. Dei, lib. 20. cap. 20.* Two readings therefore were anciently in the Latine, two in the Greek; one of the Greek in the Latine and no more. Firſt then that reading, *Omnes quidem reſurgemus, &c.* which is at this day in the Vulgar Latine, was by the teſtimony of *S. Ierome* and *S. Auſtin* the ordinary reading in their times, and is alſo uſed by *Tertullian*, *Horum demutationem ad Corinthios dedit, dicens, Omnes quidem reſurgemus, non autem omnes demutabimur, De Reſur. Carnis, c. 42.* And although *S. Ierome* teſtifieth that it was not to be found in the Greek Copies, yet to the ſame purpoſe it is amongſt the *Varia Lectiones March. Veleſ. Πάντες ἀναστήσομεθα, ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντες ἀποθανέμεθα.* And in codice *Claromontano*, the Greek is eraſed in this place, but the Latine left is, *Omnes quidem reſurgemus.* As for the ſecond Reading, *Omnes dormiemus, &c.* this was anciently in the Latine Copies according to *S. Auſtin*, and alſo in the Greek, according to *S. Ierome*. *Didymus* did ſo read it, and contend for that reading, Scio quod in nonnullis codicibus ſcriptum ſit, *Non quidem omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*; Sed conſiderandum eſt an ei quod præmiſſum eſt, *Omnes immutabimur*, poſſit convenire quod ſequitur, *Mortui ſurgent incorrupti, & nos immutabimur.* Si enim omnes immutabuntur, & hoc commune cum cæteris eſt, ſuperfluum fuit dicere, & nos immutabimur. Quamobrem ita legendum eſt, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*, *Apud S. Hieron. Epiſt. 152.* Indeed *Acacius Biſhop of Caſarea* doth not only acknowledge this Reading, but ſayeth it was in moſt Copies. Dicamus primum de eo, quod magis in plurimis codicibus invenitur. Ecce myſterium dico vobis, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non omnes autem immutabimur.* The *Alexandrian MS.* may confirm this leſſion, which reads it thus, *Οἱ πάντες μὲν ἡ καὶ ἀποθανέμεθα, ἡ πάντες ἡ ἀναστήσομεθα*, for the firſt ἡ is not written in the line but above it. And the *Ethiopic Verſion* to the ſame purpoſe. *Omnes nos moriemur,*

Where.

to this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed then here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgement of an over-ruling justice? That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth, that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below: it is absolutely necessary to believe and professe, that a just and exact retribution is deferr'd, that a due and proportionate dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world, & consequently that there is an Universall Judgement to come.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a Judgement to come, thereby effectually to provoke our selves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetnesse of our sins, such the connaturalnesse of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own soul. But being once perswaded of a judgement, and with all possessed with a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with Felix? who will not flee from the wrath to come? what must the hardnesse be of that impenitent heart which treasureth up unto itself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgement of God? We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all externall rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfie any other desires then our own: especially the dictates of the word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not onely so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of Gods revealed will; that God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel. There is in every man not onely a power to reflect, but a necessary reflection upon his actions, not onely a voluntary remembrance; but also an irresistable judgement of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own soules, we should be regardlesse of our own sentence, and wholly unconcern'd in our own condemnations. But if we were perswaded that these reflexions of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunall of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and indeavour above all things for a good conscience. For seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godlinesse looking for and hastning unto the coming of the day of God. Reason it self will tell us thus much; but if that doe not, or if we will not hearken to our own voices, the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, it is necessary to professe faith in Christ as Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting

ing our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the Judgement to come, onely as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunall, or happinesse at the last day. We must confesse that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgement, as such, there can be nothing but a fearfull expectation of eternall misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happinesse. It is necessary therefore that we should believe that Christ shall sit upon the throne, that our redeemer shall be our judge; that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the law, but the mildness and mercies of the Gospel; and then we may look upon not only the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope, whatsoever text administheth any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the Judgement to come; because by that Gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose Gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, *we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren.* As one of our brethren he hath redeemed us, he hath laid down his life as a ranfome for us. He is our High Priest who made an atonement for our sins, *a merciful and faithfull High Priest in all things, being made like unto his brethren.* He which is Judge is also our Advocate, and who shall condemn us, if he shall passe the sentence upon us, who maketh intercession for us? Well therefore may *we have boldnesse and acesse with confidence by the faith of him unto the throne of that Judge, who is our Brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High Priest, who is our Advocate, who will not by his word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already in the same word absolved us, saying, Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.*

Having thus explained the nature of the judgement to come and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, I believe in him who *shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much. I am fully perswaded of this as of an infallible and necessary truth, that the eternall Son of God, in that humane nature, in which he dyed, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, shall certainly come from the same heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those which shall be then alive, and all which ever lived and shall be before that day dead: when causing them all to stand before his judgement seat he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh; and passing the sentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels, and pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the elect, shall translate them into his glorious kingdome of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ, *who shall judge the quick and the dead.*

ARTICLE

the Spirit is taken for that which is not a Person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever any thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost, as to a Person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a Person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. This therefore we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate; first, that the Scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a Person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be spoken of the Spirit of God any other way than as of a Person: secondly, that whatsoever attributes or expressions are used in the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant, as is objected, or, if they be, they belong unto the Spirit as it signifies not a Person.

First then the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God is clearly and formally opposed to those evil Spirits, which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spirituall and intellectuall subsistence. As, *the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from the Lord troubled him.* Now, what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of Ahab, concerning whom we read, *there came out a Spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him: and the Lord said unto him; wherewith? and he said, I will goe out and be a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his prophets, and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; and goe out and doe even so.* From whence it is evident that the evil Spirits from God were certain persons, even bad Angels, to which the one good Spirit as a person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again, the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signes of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable persons; and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged persons. We are exhorted by the Apostle *not to grieve the Spirit of God*, and grief is certainly a personal affection of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same *spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*; and we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personall: for he *searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God*, and so he knoweth all things, *even the things of God*; which can be no description of the power of God; he *worketh all the spiritual gifts dividing to every man severally as he will*; in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a person. He revealeth the will of God and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a person; for *the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and goe with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them*: and the Holy Ghost said unto the Prophets and teachers at Antioch, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.* We cannot better understand the Nature of the Holy Ghost then by the description given by Christ which sent him: and he said thus to his Disciples, *The Comforter (or, the Advocate) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, he shall testifie of me: and ye also shall*

1 Sam. 16. 14.

2 Chron. 18.
20, 21.

Ephes. 4. 30.

Rom. 8. 26.

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11

Acts 10. 19.

Acts 13. 2.

John 14. 26.

15. 26, 27.

shall bear witness. If I goe not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world and he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come; he shall glorifie me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a person, a person hearing, a person receiving, a person testifying, a person speaking, a person reproving, a person instructing.

16.7;8;13,14

The † Adversaries to this truth acknowledging all these personall expressions, answer that it is ordinary in the Scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given unto those things which are no persons: as when the Apostle saith *a Charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not it self, is not puffed up, doth not behave it self unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh none evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which personal actions are attributed to charity which is no person, as in other cases it is usual, but belonging to that person which is charitable; because that person which is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, "say they, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but onely the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; because that God the Father is a person and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read the Spirit said unto Peter, *Behold three men seek thee; arise therefore and get thee down and goe with them doubting nothing; for I have sent them:* we must understand that God the Father was the person which spake those words, and which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them,* we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called Barnabas and Saul, and to whom they were to be separated; but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the

† The present Adversaries to this truth are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus first delivered by Socinus,

Quod in testimoniis sacris quæ adversarii citant Spiritui S. actiones tribuuntur, & ea quæ personarum sunt propria, ex hoc nihil concludi potest, cum aliis rebus quas personas non esse constat, similiter in Scripturis sacris actiones tribuantur, & ea quæ sunt propria personarum. Cujus rei plenissimam fidem facere potest vel locus ille Pauli 1 Cor. 13. à v. 4. ad 8. ubi perpetuo de Charitate, tanquam de persona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens, quæ revera non nisi in personam cadunt, *Fausus Socinus contra Wickum, c. 10.* a 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. * So the Racovian catechism doth enlarge this Answer, stating the question thus, Qui vero in Scripturæ loci accipiendi sunt in quibus Sp. S. actiones personarum propriæ & ad Deum ipsum spectantes attribuuntur, And returning this solution, Ad eum modum, quo in Scripturis rebus id attribuitur sæpenumero, quod personarum est, neque tamen res illæ propterea personæ censentur, ut peccato, quod deceperit, & occiderit, Rom. 7. 11. & legi, quod loquatur, Rom. 3. 19. & Scripturæ quod prospiciat & prænnunciet, Gal. 3. 8. & Charitati quod sit longanimis, &c. 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique Spiritui, i. e. vento, quod spiraret ubi vellet, cap. 6. Vide Socini Epistolam 3. ad Petrum Stavorium. "Quod si quis dixerit satis constare Paulum eo in loco figurate loqui, & charitatis nomine eum intelligere, qui charitate est præditus quatenus ea est præditus: respondebo, Cum Spiritus S. sit Spiritus Dei, certumque sit aliqui spiritum alicujus personæ non posse esse personam ab ea cujus est Spiritus distinctam, non minus constare cum Spiritui S. ea tribuuntur, quæ personæ & simul ipsius Dei sunt propria, nihil aliud intelligendum nomine Spiritus S. esse, quam ipsum Deum spiritu suo, id est, virtute atque efficacia sua, agentem atque operantem. F. Socinus ibid. Quoniam vero Spiritus S. virtus Dei est, hinc fit ut ea quæ Dei sunt, Spiritui S. attribuantur, & sub nomine Spiritus S. sæpe Deus ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deus per Spiritum suum exercit, *Catech. Racov. ibid. Añ. 10. 20. Añ. 13. 2.*

Holy

Holy Ghost. This is the summe of their answer; and more then this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that Argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a person.

But this Answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the Argument. For if all the personal actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory, but if these actions be personal, as they are acknowledged and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose spirit it is, if he cannot be said to doe that, by the power within him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that defence not to be defended; then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a person. But I shall clearly prove, that there are several personal attributes given in the Sacred Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father, which God the Father by that power which is in him cannot be said to doe; and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.

Rom. 8. 27.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God.* But to make intercession, is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to

Iob. 15. 26.

Iob. 16. 7.

intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no Prosopopeia, the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of intercession for that reason because it is the spirit of that person which intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personal action, and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come being sent; *when the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father, saith*

Iob. 16. 13.

Iob. 16. 14.

Christ, and again, *If I goe not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him to you.* But to come unto men as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son (*whom the Father will send in my name*, saith our Saviour.) When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personal action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a Prosopopeia, by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to doe it. To speak and hear are personal actions; and both together attributed to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father. *When he, saith Christ, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truths; for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak.* Now to speak and not of himself cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doeth all things of himself; to speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorifie him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost, *He shall glorifie me for he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you*, is by no means applicable to the Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost

is

is therefore said to doe these personal actions, because that person, whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth therefore that the Answer given by the Adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our Argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

I thought this discourse had fully destroy'd the Socinian Prosopopeias; and indeed as they ordinarily propound their Answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I finde the subtilty of Socinus prepared another explication of the Prosopopeia to supply the roome where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double Figure he groundeth upon this distinction. The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in which it worketh, and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

So that now we must not onely shew that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father. And this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already shew'd cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an Apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send S. Peter an Advocate to S. Peter: and S. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son did come unto S. Peter. Againe our Saviour speaking of the Holy Ghost saith, *He shall receive of mine*: therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is not taken for the Father, and shew it unto you, therefore he is not taken for an Apostle, in that he receiveth. the first Socinian Prosopopeia is improper; in that he sheweth to the Apostle, the second is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a Person distinct from the Person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct from the person of the Apostle in whom he worketh, and consequently neither of the Socinian Figures can evacuate or enervate the Doctrine of his proper and peculiar Personality.

Secondly for those Attributes or expressions used of the Holy Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a Person, either they are not so repugnant, or if they be they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifieth not the Person but

consideratur & accipitur, ut res in quibus agit, ab ipsa afficiuntur, utrique isti figuræ similiter aptissimus est locus, quandoquidem commodissime per metonymiam is qui à Spiritu S. aliquomodo affectus quidpiam agit, quatenus id agit Spiritus Sancti seu Spiritus Dei metonymicè dici potest: ut factum est apud Paulum, cum ait. (1 Cor. 2. 10.) Spiritum (sub. Dei) omnia scrutari etiam profunda Dei: ubi Spiritus Dei nomine sine dubio intellexit hominem Spiritu Dei præditum, quatenus vix ab isto Spiritu afficitur. Jam per prosopopeiam ipsi Spiritui S. actionem tribui, quæ ipsius Spiritus ope ab homine fiat adeo est proclive ut nihil magis, F. Socinus, in Resp. ad Whetum cap. 10.

*Credo me satis ostendisse Spiritum S. non esse personam, non magis quam aliarum vel proprietates, vel effecta Dei sint personæ, cum nihil sit aliud quàm peculiaris quædam virtus & efficacia Dei, quæ si ut ipseus Dei proprietates, & vis per quam agit consideratur & accipitur, figuræ metonymiæ aut prosopopeiæ accommodatissimus est locus: & metonymiæ quidem, si Spiritus S. nomine ipse Deus cuius est Spiritus, quique per eum agit significatur; prosopopeiæ vero, ut quando Deus per Spiritum S. agit ipsi Spiritui S. Dei actio tribuatur: sin autem hæc virtus & efficacia Dei

† Spiritum S. non esse Deitatis Personam hinc discere potes, primum, quod ea quæ Spiritui S. in Scripturis attribuantur, nulla prorsus ratione Personæ conveniant, ut sunt quod datur, quod ex eo datur, idque aut secundum mensuram, aut absque omni mensura, quod effundatur ipse & ex ipso effundatur, & quod eo potentur homines, quod augeatur, quod in duplo datur, in partes distribuitur, tollatur ipse, & ex ipso tollatur, & similia in Scripturis extant. Catech. Racov. c. 6. Quæst. 12. a. Art. 32.

the gifts or effects of the Spirit. † They tell us that the Spirit is given; and that, sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure; that the Spirit is poured out, and that men do drink of it, and are filled with it; that it is doubled and distributed, and something is taken from it, and that sometimes it is extinguished: and from hence they gather that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, because these expressions are inconsistent with personality. But a satisfactory Answer is easily returned to this objection. 'Tis true, that God is said to have *given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him*, but it is as true that a Person may be given; so we read in the Prophet Isaiah, *unto us a Son is given*, and we are assured that *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*, and certainly the Son of God is a Person. And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a person, yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our Assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in the Scriptures the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of those operations. And being to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already shewn those attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but a Person; we therefore conclude against the Socinians and the † Jews, that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a Person; which is our first Assertion.

Our second Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, Person. And for the proof of this Assertion, we shall first make use of that Argument which our Adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created person. But the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God which is in God, and therefore not a created person. This argument is raised from those words of the Apostle, *For who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God*. That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost I find denied by none. That the same Spirit is in God, appeareth by the Apostles discourse, and is granted by the * Socinians:

† The Opinion of the Jews was, that the Holy Ghost was nothing else but the afflatus or energy of God; and therefore they which denied the substantiality of the Spirit were look'd upon as symbolizing with the Jews in this particular. Lactantius in libris suis, & maxime in Epistolis ad Demetrianum Spiritus S. omnino negat substantiam; & errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, & sanctificationem utriusque Personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari. S. Hieron. Epist. 55. Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the opinion of the Jews, who delivering the several significations of *rua*, maketh the fifth and sixth to be these. Quinto significat Influentiam illam intellectualem divinam à Deo Prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute prophetant. Sexto significat Propositum; & Voluntatem. And then concludes: Vox hæc *rua* quando Deo attribuitur, ubique sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatione, quatenus voluntatem significat, More Nevochim, pag. 1. cap. 40. c. 1 Corinth. 2. 11. The Socinians endeavouring to prove from this place that the Holy Ghost is not a person, lay the foundation of their Argument in this, that he is the spirit of God, and by nature in God, so that those things which are proper to the divine nature are attributed and belong to him, and because there is another person in the divine essence, and, as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a Person. Deinde idem (sc. Sp. S. non esse personam) ex eo patet, quod non sit extra Deum natura sed in ipso Deo. Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisset Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco, 1 Cor. 2. 11, ubi ait, *Quis hominum novit quæ sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui in est homine? ita quæ sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei*. Quoniam vero Spiritus S. in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu S. reciproce dici potest esse Deum, hinc apparet Sp. S. non esse Personam. Præterea cum superius demonstratum sit unam tantum esse in Deitate personam, & Spiritus S. sit Dei virtus, ut verba Christi ad Apostolos indicant, Luc. 24. 49. efficitur Spiritum S. non esse personam divinam. Denique si Spiritus S. esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam cum habere opereretur. Nam ea attribuantur illi quæ propria sunt essentia divinæ: at superius docuimus substantiam divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quam-
that

obrem Sp. non esse Deitatis personam planum est, Catech. Rachov. c. 6. To the same purpose doth Socinus argue against Wiekus, that the nature of the Spirit is the nature of God, and that the Spirit cannot therefore be a person, because there can be but one person in the nature of God. Whereas therefore independently from this place we have proved that the Holy Spirit is a person, and from this place have inferr'd with them; that the same spirit is in God and of the divine nature, it followeth that he is no created Spirit, inasmuch as nothing in the divine nature can be created.

that it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth therefore undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created person; inasmuch as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature, and that can neither have nor be a created nature, which by nature is in God. Wherefore although it be replied by others, that it is not said in the text that the spirit is in God, yet our Adversaries reason overweighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not express'd, which must be acknowledged to be understood. The Holy Ghost then is a person, (as I have proved) and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God, (as is confessed, and onely denied to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied,) therefore he is no created Person.

Secondly, the Holy Ghost is such an one, as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no Person, we could not commit that sin against him; and if he were a created Person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a Person, and that uncreated. The Argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, * All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world neither in the world to come. By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it beyond other sins and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies.

To this they answer, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not to our purpose; but they doe not, cannot shew that it can be unpardonable if he were not God. It is not therefore simply, and for no other reason, unpardonable, because that person is God against whom it is committed; for if so, then any sin committed against any person which is God would be unpardonable; which is false. But that sin, which is particularly called blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is a sin against God, and in such a manner aggravated, as makes it irremissible; of which aggravation it were incapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly, every created person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is He now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created person. All things were made by the Word, and with-

* Mat. 12. 31.
32. Quomodo audent inter omnia numerare Spiritum S. quando ipse Dominus dixerit, Qui blasphemaverit in Filium hominis remittetur ei, qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum S. nec hic nec in futurum remittetur ei. Quomodo igitur inter creaturas audent quisquam Spiritum computare? Aut quis sic se obligat, ut si creatura derogaverit, non putet sibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum? S. Ambrose De Spiritu S. l. 1. cap. 3.
Iohn 1. 3.

out him was not any thing made that was made; therefore every created person was made by the Word. God hath put all things under the feet of Christ, and when he saith all things are put under him; it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him: and being none is excepted beside God, every created person must be under the feet of the Son of man, But the Spirit of God in the beginning was not made, ye rather in the beginning made the world; as * Job speaks of God, *By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens*; nor is he under the feet of Christ, now set down at the right hand of God, who with supreme authority together with the Father sent the Prophets, as Isaiah testifieth, saying, *Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me*, and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of Barnabas and Saul, and † with the same authority giveth all spirituall gifts, * *dividing to every man severally as he will*; so that in this kingdome of Christ all things are done^b by the power of the Spirit of God.

Those which
anciently did
believe the Spi-
rit of God to be
a created per-
son, did also
teach that he
was made by
the Son, as E-
piphanius testi-
fies of the A-

rians. Παρὶ
 τοῦτο δὴ λόγον ἔστιν
 ὅτι ὁμολογεῖσιν
 τὰς ἀγγέλους ὑπὸ
 τῆς ψῆς γαρὶ τῆς
 καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ
 Πρωτόμαχου βλα-
 σφημῶσι καὶ πολ-
 μῶσι λέγειν κα-
 τὰ τὴν ὑπὸ τῆ
 ψῆς. *Her.* 69.

§. 52. Ariani
ab Ario, in eo
sunt notissimi
errore quo
Patrem & Fi-
lium, & Spi-
ritum. S. no-

lunt esse unius
est, ab ipso Filio
mors, ἐπει μὴ ἐκ
παίρει δι' αὐτὴν ἐξ
σημασίως τοῦ
ἐκκλητῆς Πνδύμα

observation, the
 out those words
 All things which
 were made, and
 διὰ τοῦ, διὰ τοῦ μὴ
 καὶ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ
 λαὸν καὶ τὸν Πᾶν
 τὰ γὰρ πάντα διὰ τοῦ
 διὰ, ὅτι πάντα διὰ
 Ταῦτα πάντα ἐκ
 ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ
 καὶ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ
 ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ
 ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ
 ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ

† This expression
acknowledged the
which followed the
Eunomius, & E
like denied the
out of the words
Εὐν. ἢ ὡς ἐστὶν ἐκ
φύσει πρὸς ὅλην
in order and dign
the Ancients ne

Fourthly, He, by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, was no created Person: for by virtue of that conception he was called the Son of God; whereas if a creature had been the cause of his conception, he had been in that respect the son of a creature, nay according to the Adversaries principles, he had taken upon him the nature of Angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. For it was an Angel that said to Mary, (not that an Angel, but that,) *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* Therefore the Spirit of God is no created Person; which is our second Assertion against the ancient, but newly revived Heresie of the [†]Arians and Macedonians,

[illegible]

Our

ὁ Κύριος intend Christ and not the most High God the Father, in these following places, 1 Cor. 3. 5. 4. 19. 7. 10, 12. 16. 7. 1 Thess. 4. 6. 5. 27. 2 Thess. 3. 1, 3, 16. 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 2. 7. And beside I ask, how the pretence of this general rule can be properly objected by those who knew that they to whom they doe object this Rule, have contended that this title is elsewhere attributed to the Holy Ghost. As S. Basil, upon that place, 2 Thess. 3. 5. Ο ὁ Κύριος κατευθύνει ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἁποστολήν τοῦ Χριστοῦ thus disputes, Τίς ὁ κατευθύνων Κύριος; εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπην, καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποστολήν; ἀποκρισάδωσαν ἡμεῖς οἱ τοῦ Πνεύματος κατευθύνοντες. Εἰτι γὰρ οὐκ οὐ Πατέρις ὁ λόγος. πάντως αὖ ἐρρωτο, ὁ ὅς Κύριος ὁμοῖ κατευθύνει εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ οὐ τὸν Θεόν, ἀποκρισάδωσαν, εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀποστολήν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Πόλον Κύριον εὐχόμεθα ἡμεῖς εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός, ἡμῶν δὲ τῆς πατρὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἀκριμῶς τὰς καρδίας ἐξηγητὰς ἐν ἀγαθῇ ᾧ ἐν Θεοπαλόνῃ πνεύμῳ ἐκφράζας. Ἀποκρισάδωσαν ἡμεῖς οἱ μὲν ὅτι λειτουργοὶ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ διακονοῦντες ἀποστολῶν (the newly-revived opinion clearly) τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλ' οὐ ἔχουσιν, De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 21.

the Lord in the language of the same Apostle may not signifie the second, but the first or third person of the Trinity. If then the Lord be the eternall God, as the Apostle without any question understood him in Moses, if the Spirit be the Spirit of the Lord, as the Apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following, then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternall God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

Again, the same Scriptures doe clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when Peter said, *Ananias, Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lye to the Holy Ghost?* he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence, *Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lyed unto men, but unto God.* To lye unto the Holy Ghost, is to lye unto God: to lye unto the Holy Ghost, is not to lye unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man, and consequently not to lye unto any Angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an Angel, not to lye unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature; but to lye unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.

To this plain and evident Argument there are so many Answers, that the very multitude discovers the weaknesse of them all: for if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First, they answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the *Holy Ghost* in the Original is † put in one case, and *God* in another, and the Apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot shew that the Spirit is God. To which is easily answered, that the case or manner of the Apostles speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lye unto him, or by a lye to endeavour to deceive him. The Act objected to Ananias was but one, which act of his the Apostles look'd upon as injurious not to themselves but to the Holy Ghost; and therefore S. Peter shew'd the sin to be not against men but against God; as certainly then as the Apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of S. Peter, God.

As for that sense which they put upon the words, different from that of lying to God, as if Ananias were accused for counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of Ananias is again expressed in the case of his wife Sapphira, to whom S. Peter said, *How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* but to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two severall things. And it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit, was nothing else but lying to him. For S. Peter said to Sapphira, *Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much; And she said, Yea, for so much.* In which answer she lyed.

† Ex his facile apparet haudquaquam ex eo loco concludi posse Spiritum S. esse Deum, cum alio modo de Spiritu S. loquatur Petrus, alio de Deo. Illic dicit mentiri seu fallere, ac ludificari Spiritum S. hic mentiri Deo, Crellius de uno Deo Patre, l. 1. §. 3. Argum. 1.

lyed, Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? viz. in saying that ye sold the land for so much. Here is no colour then for that new pretence, that Ananias did bear the Apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit and bely the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound S. Peter, but to bely Ananias, and make him guilty of that sin which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lyed, it is also certain that he to whom he lyed was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well † translated that he lyed to the Holy Ghost.

† Our translation is here accused without reason. For though the Original be $\phi\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\omicron$, yet some Copies have it $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\tau$, and the Syriack did so read and interpret it

תהיה כדורא
וְקִדְרָא, the
Vulgar Latine
so the same
purpose, men-
ti in Spiritui
S. And the
Author of the
Traſſate de
temp. Barbari-
co, under the
name of S. Au-
ſtin, mentiri
te apud Spiritu
S. cap. 3.
Now ἡ αὐτὴ
eis το αὐτῶμα
is the same with
το αὐτῶμα, as
Μὴ διὰ τοῦ αὐ-
τῶματος, Lye
not one to
another. If
we read it eis
αὐτῶμα then, it
is right trans-
lated. Again,
if we read it
το αὐτῶμα, it
has in this case
the sense of
αὐτῶμα.
As Psal. 66.2.
וְכִשְׁרֵי אֲנִי

Next, because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God: and the reason, which they render to justify this negation, is, because there are severall places of the Scripture, in which the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God, as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they alledge those words of the Apostle, *a He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath also given us his holy spirit*: I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question: for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, *he therefore that despiseth*, it hath no relation to the present question; and if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, *b He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*; it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which founds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our Assertion; first, that they lyed to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that, in doing so, they lyed not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lyed unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation. For if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man; it might as well have been said, you lyed not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the Apostles would have aggravated the sin of Ananias with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, thou hast not lyed unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God. But being he first told him plainly his sin, *lying to the Holy Ghost*, and then let him know the sinfulness of it, *thou hast not lyed unto men, but unto God*: it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lyed is God.

Thirdly, that Person whose inhabitation maketh a temple, is God : for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God, if to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabitation of any created person can make a Temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, if we read it so *מבואות*, it has in this case the sense of *מבואות*. As Psal. 66. *בכחו יך איבר*, LXX. *Οὐρανὸς ἰσχυρὸς* &c, of the same sense with that Psalm. 18. 61. *יכחו יך*, LXX. *Καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεὸς* &c. And Isa. 57. 11. *Κυρίῳ ἱεροδοκίῳ* &c. So Deut. 33. 26. *יך*, LXX. *Καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεὸς* &c. And Isa. 57. 11. *Κυρίῳ ἱεροδοκίῳ* &c. 2 King. 4. 16. *הוּא הוּא הוּא הוּא*, &c. If therefore we read it *יך* &c. it is rightly translated tolye unto the Holy Ghost; and so agreeeth with that which followeth to temple the Holy Ghost, as Psalm. 78. 36. *וְהָיָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן לְךָ* &c. and verse 41. *וְהָיָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן לְךָ* &c. Therefore whatsoever shifts are layd upon the phrase, or difference of expression, are either false or frivolous. a 1 Theſſ. 4. 8. b Math. 10. 40. Luke 10. 16.

as we are informed by the Apostle, *What know ye not that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Therefore the Holy Ghost is God. 1 Cor. 6. 19.

To this is replied indifferently according to the diversity of our Adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tell us that if we would inforce by this reason, that the Holy Ghost is God; we must † prove that he is a person, and that he doth possesse our bodies by a divine right. But we have already proved that he is a person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary but that which more confirmeth our Assertion; for they urge onely those words of the Apostle, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* We do certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God dwelleth therefore in us; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but onely because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Person not divine, or any thing but a Person though divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us, or if he did, that by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but onely this, that being the Holy Ghost who possesseth us, is a Person; we must shew that our bodies are his by the Highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honour: which he therefore conceives we cannot shew, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honour. But it were very strange, if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they which are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honour. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then Christ can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the Apostle had said, as our Adversary doth, that *we ought with our body to glorifie, not the Spirit, but God.* I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God; but being that blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the Apostles, never taught us not to glorifie him, I shall rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy, then the Assertion of his Deity to be false Divinity. And whereas it is said, that the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation; this is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this onely notion I am fully confirmed in the beliefe of my Assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us but by the inhabitation of the Spirit: for though it be said I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God but by the inhabitation of God, as it is written, *Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.* And therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God which dwelleth in us.

Fourthly, He, to whom the divine attributes doe belong as certainly

† Si quis ex eo quod corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templum sit, concludere velit eum esse Deum, illi demonstrandum est ita corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templum dici, ut intelligatur eum esse personam cujus honori corpus nostrum sit dedicatum, à qua corpus nostrum eo jure quod divini numinis proprium est, possideatur, & principaliter incolatur, *Crellius de uno Deo Patre, lib. 1. Sect. 3.*
a 1 Cor 3. 16.

2 Cor. 6. 16.

tainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are proprieties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be indue'd with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are Omniscience, Omnipotency, Omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them, and they are so many that to manage them against the exceptions of the Adversaries would take up too much room in this discourse: especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

Fifthly, He, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God: because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are, and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of Creation and Conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an Exposition, I conclude my third Assertion; that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly divine, the true and living God.

Now being we doe firmly believe that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the divine essence is incapable of multiplicity; being we have already shewn that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none, and have also proved that the onely Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to shew how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth Assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God.

First, though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods,) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father. For the Scriptures doe as certainly distinguish them in their persons, as they doe unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father.

Secondly, though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God, though we now have also proved that the

John 15. 26.

the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son. For he which receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorify himself by so receiving. But the Comforter, *who is the Holy Ghost*, received of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for our Saviour expressly said, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.* John 16. 15. Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again, He whose coming depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure; as he told the Apostles before he departed, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I goe away; for if I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you:* therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly, though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost be also the same God, yet we are assured that the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son; because the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both from the Father and the Son. As, when *the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and loe, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,* he was manifestly distinguished from the person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the person of the Father, who spake from heaven of his Son. The Apostle teacheth us that *through the Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father*, and consequently assureth us that the Spirit, *by whom*, is not the Father, *to whom*, nor the Son, *through whom*, we have that access. So God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons: and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.* Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us severall times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; the Comforter whom, I will send unto you from the Father*, and when that Comforter is come, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I conclude therefore against the old † Sabellian Heresie, that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father nor God the Son; which is my fourth Assertion.

Our fifth Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the blessed Trinity. For being he is a Person, by our first Assertion;

afterwards all so denominated from Sabellius. For we find it was the opinion of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote. *Who being urged with that place where the three persons were distinguished, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, the power of the highest shall overshadow thee, Therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God, answered thus, Filius Dei Deus est, & virtus altissimi altissimus est.* After Praxeas followed Noetus, *μὴν ὁ αὐτὸς Πατήρ, καὶ υἱὸς, καὶ ἅγιος Πνεῦμα ὁμοούσιον,* Epiph. Her. 57. Noetiani a quodam Noeto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem & Spiritum S. S. Aug. Her. 36. Suddenly after Noetus arose Sabellius. *ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ Σαβελλιανὸς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν υἱόν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οἷς εἶναι & μὴ ὁμοούσιον ἡρώδης ὁνομασμένος,* Epiph. Her. 62. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called Sabellians. Sabelliani ab illo Noeto quem supra memoravimus defluxisse dicuntur. Nam & discipulum ejus quidam perhibere fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses Epiphanius computet nescio, cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, & ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficillime ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem fuisse in ore multorum, S. Aug. Her. 41.

Y y

a Per-

a Person not created, by the second; but a divine Person, properly and truly God, by the third; being though he is truly God, he is neither the Father nor the Son, by the fourth Assertion, it followeth that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor lesse then three, so there is also an order by which, of these Persons the Father is the first, the Son the Second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or externall, but internall and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of Order, by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son: though therefore this was also done from all Eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time; yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father who is the first Person cannot be the first, receiving the same from the Son who is the Second, cannot be the second, but being from the first and second must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the Persons are signified together by the Apostle saying, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismall Institution made in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have, but briefly, spoken, prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth Assertion.

1 John 5. 7.

† Vide p. 68.
So Epiphanius
several times
calls the Holy
Spirit *τρίτος*
αὐτοῦς.

Our sixth and last Assertion, (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God,) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father, and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes and operations with the Father, and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, and because the Father hath been already shewn to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

John 15. 26.

Secondly, though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the

the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the language of the Apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit which is of God.* And *we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God.* Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; for *because we are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts: the Spirit of Christ, Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his; even the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets;* the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through my prayer & the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ.* If then the Holy Spirit be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceeded from the Father, it followeth, that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

Again, because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath by the original communication a right of mission; as, *the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send.* But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you.* Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son because he received not the Godhead from him, but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit, because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit: but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature common to both the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As therefore the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so doe they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son.

From whence it came to passe in the Primitive times that the Latine Fathers taught expressly the proceffion of the Spirit from the Father à Patre, non separatur à Filio, *S. Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto, c. 10. Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus est procedens quidem à Patre & Filio: sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque; Id. de Symb. c. 3. Et in servos celestia dona profudit. Spiritum ab Unigena Sanctum & Patre procedentem, Paulinus in Nat. 9. S. Felix. Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus S. & à Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra Spiritus & Patris & Filii spiritus dicitur. S. Aug. de Trinit. l. 4. Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites, eundem Spiritum S. qui Patris & Filii unus est Spiritus, de Patre & Filio procedere, Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum. Qui noster Dominus, qui tuus unicus Spiritus de patri corde Paraclitum, Prud. Hymn. 5. Cathem. Tanquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus S. nominetur, nec alius est qui genuit, alius qui genitus est, alius qui de utroque processit. Leo speaking of the Sabellian Heresie, Epist. 93. c. 1. Audi manifestius proprium Patris esse genuisse, & proprium Filii natum fuisse: proprium vero Sp. S. procedere de Patre Filioque Vigilantius contra Eut. l. 1. By which testimonies and the like of the Latine Fathers we may well guesse in which Church the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius first was framed; for as it is confessed to be written first in Latine, so it is most probable that it was composed by some member of the Latine Church, by that expression in it, Spiritus S. à Patre & Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.*

Matth. 10. 20.

1 Cor. 11. 12.

Galat. 4. 6.

Rom. 8. 9.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Phil. 1. 19.

John 14. 26.

† This is not the late but ancient opinion of the Latine Church, as will appear by these testimonies, Loqui de eo (Sp. S.) non necesse est, quia de Patre & Filio auctoribus confitendus est, S. Hilary. de Trinit. l. 2. Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit à Patre & Filio, non separatur à Patre & Filio, non separatur à Patre, non separatur à Filio, non separatur à Patre & Filio.

of impiety and blasphemy, and onely answers to the Argument so far as it concerned his expression, viz. that the Spirit is *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος*, but in this Answer makes use of that Scripture which he and others used to prove that the Spirit had his essence from the Son. *Ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον.* Although therefore S. Cyril doth not go to maintain that which Theodoret denied, and S. Cyril elsewhere teacheth, viz. that the Holy Ghost is from the Son, yet he justified his own position by that Scripture which by himself and the rest of the Fathers is thought to teach as much.

rence, making use of the Greeks expression against the doctrine both of Greeks and Latines; denying that the Holy Ghost receiveth his essence from the Son, because the Scripture saith, he proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But S. Cyril against whom he wrote, taking small notice of this Objection; and the writings of Theodoret in which this was contained being condemned; there was no sensible difference in the Church, for many years, concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and severall disputations did arise in the Western Church, till at last the Latines put it into the * Constantinopolitan Creed, and being admonished by the

* The second General Council held at Constantinople, finding it necessary to make an addition to the Nicene Creed in the Article con-

cerning the Holy Ghost, of which that Council had said no more then this, I believe in the Holy Ghost, framed this accession against Macedonius, *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον.* in which they spake most warily, using the words of the Scripture, and the language of the Church, which was so known and publick, that it is recorded even by Lucian, in his Dialogue call'd Philoparris, *Ἐκ. καὶ τίνα ἰστοῦσιν οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον.* This Creed being received by the whole Church of God, and it being added also by the next General Council at Ephesus, that it should not be lawful to make any addition to it. Notwithstanding, the Question being agitated in the West, *Utrum Spiritus S. sicut procedit à Patre, ita & procedat à Filio*, and it being concluded in the affirmative, they did not onely declare the doctrine to be true, but also added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sang it publicly in their Liturgy. *Credimus & in Spiritum S. Domini & vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem.* This being first done in the Spanish and French Churches, and the matter being referred to Leo the third Bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated. For in the Acts of the Synod held at Aquisgranum we find it so determined by the Pope upon the conference with the Legates. *Ergo, ut video, illud à vestra Paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud de quo quæstio agitur, de sæpe facto Symbolo tollatur, & tunc demum à quolibet licite ac libere sive cantando, sive tradendo discatur & doceat.* So one of the Legates: to which Leo answered thus, *Ita proculdubio à nostra parte decernitur: ita quoque ut à vestra assentiat, à nobis omnibus modis suadetur.* Beside, least the Roman Church might be accused to joy with the Spanish and French Churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed to be publicly set forth in the Church graven in silver plates, one in Latine, and another in Greek, in the same words which the Council of Constantinople had first penned it. *Hic pro amore & cautela orthodoxæ Fidei fecit in B. Petri Basilica scuta argentea duo scripta utraque Symbolo, unum quidem literis Græcis, & alium Latinis, sedentia dextra lævaque super ingressum Corporis.* Anastasius in vita Leonis III. Leo tertius (Symboli) transcriptum in tabula argentea, post altare B. Pauli posita, posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, & cautela Fidei Orthodoxæ. In quo quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus S. solus commemoratur Pater his verbis, *Et in Spiritum S. Dominum vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre & Filio coadorandum, & glorificandum; P. Lombardus.* These were taken out of the Archiva at Rome, saith Photius, and so placed by Leo, that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true Copies of that Creed not to be altered. *Ὁ Θεὸς πᾶσι Δόξαν καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπορεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον.* Idem apud Euthymium, Panopl. Dom. tit. 12. ab eodem Archiep. exscriptus. This was the great and prudent care of Leo the third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorized by a General Council, and received by the whole Church; and by this means he quieted all discontents for his time. But not long after, the following Popes, more in love with their own Authority, then desirous of the peace and Unity of the Church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition Filioque. This was done first in the time and by the power of Pope Nicolaus the first, who by the activity of Photius was condemned for it. Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit Photius ipsum (Nicolaum) fore excommunicatum quod affuerat ad Symbolum Spiritum S. à Filio procedere. Similiter & depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii, Antonin. Part. 3. tit. 22.

Greeks

sanctity, and so having the name of Spirit common unto them, he may be termed *Holy*, that he may be distinguished from them: yet I conceive he is rather called the *Holy Spirit*, or *the Spirit of holiness*, because, of the three Persons in the blessed Trinity, it is his particular Office to sanctifie, or make us holy. Rom. 1. 4.

Now when I speak of the Office of the Holy Ghost, I doe not understand any Ministeriall office or function, such as that of the created Angels is, who are *all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation*; for I have already proved this Spirit to be a Person properly divine, and consequently above all ministration. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our Salvation: *God so loved the world that he gave his onely begotten Son, and through that Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.* As therefore what our Saviour did & suffered, for us belonged to that Office of a Redeemer which he took upon him: so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his Office. And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we are all impure, and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence of God whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us, therefore we acknowledge the Office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this Office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of faith contained in this Article *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* Heb. 1. 14.

Now this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; being as *no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him, even so none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God*; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, and revealeth them unto the Sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expell'd, and they are enlightned with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either externall and generall, or internall and particular. The externall and generall work of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the Revelation of the will of God, by which so much in all ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternall life. For there have been *holy Prophets ever since the world began*; and prophesie came not at any time by the will of man, but *Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* When it pleased God in the last dayes to speak unto us by his Son, even that Son sent his Spirit into the Apostles, the Spirit of truth, that he might guide them into all truth, teaching them all things, and bringing all things to their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them. By this means it came to passe that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God, that is by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God; and so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe, was delivered by Revelation. Again, the John 3. 16.
Ephes. 2. 18.

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.

Luke 1. 70.

2 Pet. 1. 21.

Heb. 1. 2.

John 16. 13.

Phil. 1. 29.

Acts 16. 14.

Heb. 4. 2.

Ephes. 2. 8.

† This is the ancient determination of the second Arauscan Council, Si quis sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium Fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum quo in eum credimus qui iustificat impium, & ad regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratia donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus S. corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, & naturaliter nobis ineffe dicit, Aposto-

licis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente, *Confidimus quia qui capit in vobis bonum opus perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Iesu Christi; & illud, Vobis datum est pro Christo non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini.* Et, *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis; Dei enim donum est.* Can. 5. Concil. Araus. & Gennad. Eccl. Dogm. cap. 42. * It was the known opinion of the Pelagians that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God, and S. Austin was once of that opinion, Neque enim fidem putabam, says he, Dei gratia praeveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praeccederet praeconium veritatis. Ut autem praedicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus nostrum esse proprium, & nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla Opuscula mea satis indicant ante Episcopatum meum scripta, De Praedest. Sanct. l. 1. c. 3. But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a Bishop, he recalled and reversed in his Retractions, l. 1. c. 23. and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian Heresy. This, as the rest of Pelagianism is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechisme deliver it in this manner, Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus Sanctus interiore dono opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio. a Tit. 3. 5. b 1 Cor. 6. 11. c Gal. 5. 25. d Gal. 5. 16.

the same Spirit which revealeth the Object of Faith generally to the Universal Church of God, which object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular believer, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God not onely in the object but also in the act; Christ is not onely given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also given us in the behalfe of Christ to believe on him; and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us: by this the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul; by this the word preached profiteth being mixed with faith in them that hear it. Thus by grace are we saved through faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God. As the encrease and perfection, so the originall, or † initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not onely by an externall proposall in the word, but by an internall illumination in the soul; by which we are enclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths, which unto a naturall and carnall man are foolishnesse. And thus we affirm not onely the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soule of man, to be part of the Office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new * Pelagians.

The Second part of the Office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our naturall corruption consisting in an averfation of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For ^a according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. So that except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God. We are all at first defiled by the corruption of our nature and the Pollution of our sins; ^b but we are washed, but we are sanctified, but we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The second part then of the Office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul.

The third part of this Office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually doe and perform those things which are acceptable and well pleasing in the sight of God. ^c If we live in the Spirit, quickned by his Renovation, we must also walk in the Spirit, following his direction, led by his manuduction. And if we walk in the Spirit, we shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh; for

we

we are not onely directed, but animated and acted in those operations by the Spirit of God, *who giveth both to will and to doe*, and as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. Moreover that this direction may prove more effectually, we are also guided in our prayers, and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, *I will poure upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplications*. Whereas then this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us; and whereas we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God. From which intercession especially I conceive he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, *I will pray unto the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete*. For if any man sin we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, saith S. John: who also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul; and we have another Paraclete, saith our Saviour; which also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul. A † Paraclete then in the notion of the Scriptures is an Intercessor.

Rom. 8. 14.

Zach. 12. 10.

1 John 5. 14.

Rom. 8. 26, 27

John 14. 16.

1 John 2. 1.

Rom. 8. 34.

† Παράκλητος
is five times used in the Scriptures, and

that by S. Iohn alone: four times in his Gospel, attributed to the Holy Ghost, once in his first Epistle, spoken of Christ. When it relates to the Holy Ghost, we translate it alwayes Comforter, when to Christ we render it Advocate; of which diversity there can be no reason, because Christ who is a Paraclete said that he would send another Paraclete, and therefore the notion must be the same in both, *ὅστις παράκλητον ἔδωκεν υἱοῦν, τῷ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ὡς ἑαυτοῦ*. S. Chrys. If therefore in the language of S. Iohn *παράκλητος* be a Comforter, then Christ is the Comforter, if *παράκλητος* be an Advocate, the Holy Ghost is the Advocate. The Vulgar Latine keeps the Greek word in the Gospels Paracletus, but in the Epistle renders it advocatus. The Syriack keepeth the Original altogether without, as being of ordinary use in the writers of that and the Chaldee language, and therefore was not well translated Paracletus in the Gospels, and Advocatus in the Epistle, by Tremellius. That the Latines did use generally the word Paracletus for the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the Vulgar Latine, appeareth by the description of the Heresy of Montanus, which Tertullian calls novam prophetiam de Paraclete inundantem, de Resur. Carnis, cap. 63. & spiritalem rationem Paraclete autore, contra Marcio. l. 1. c. 29. And yet the ancientest Latine Translations rendered it advocatus even in the Gospels in reference to the Spirit. As we read it in Tertullian; Bene quod & Dominus usus hoc verbo in persona Paracleti, non divilionem significavit sed dispositionem. Rogabo enim, inquit, Patrem, & alium advocatum mittere vobis, Spiritum veritatis. Adv. Prax. cap. 9. So Novatianus, Ego rogabo Patrem, & alium advocatum dabis vobis, Nec non etiam subdidit illud quoque, Advocatus autem Spiritus S. quem missurus est Pater, ille vos docebit, de Trinit. c. 28. Cum venerit Advocatus ille quem ego mittam, Apud S. Hilary, Sumus nunc quidem consolati, quia Dominus ait, Mittere vobis Patrem & alium Consolatorem, Emar. in Psal. 125. And 'tis possible that some which used Advocatus might understand so much: for in the ancient Christian Latine & Advocare significeth to comfort, and Advocatio consolationis as being the bare interpretations of *παράκλησις* and *παράκλησις*. As Tertullian translates *παράκλησις* *πρόσκλησις*, Isa. 61. 2. Advocare languentes. Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 14. So when we read, Væ vobis divitibus, quia habetis consolationem vestram; Tertullian read it, Væ vobis divitibus, quoniam receperitis advocacionem vestram, Adv. Marcio. l. 4. c. 15. And speaking in his own language, Beati, inquit, stantes atque lugentes. Quis talia sine patientia tolerat? Itaque talibus & advocatio & risus promittitur, De Patient. c. 11. And as S. Hilary read it, so did S. August. expound it, Consolabuntur Spiritu S. qui maxime propterea Paracletus nominatur, id est, Consolator, De Sermon. Dom. in Monte, l. 1. c. 4. Cum Christus promiserit suis missurum se Paracletum, id est, Consolatorem vel Advocatum, contra Faustum l. 13. c. 17. Consolator ergo ille, vel Advocatus, utrumque enim interpretatur quod est Græce Paracletus, Expos. in Ioh. Tract. 94. And as they read or expounded it, so did the Arabick Translator render it by two several words, one in the Gospel, another in the Epistle, both signifying Consolator. Now what they meant by Advocatus is evident, that is one which should plead the cause of Christians against their Adversaries which accused and persecuted them, that as there is an Accuser which is a Spirit, even Satan, so there should be an Advocate to plead against that Accuser, even the Holy Spirit. Necessarius nobis est ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuosi efficiamur; & ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habeamus & Paracletum, Iren. l. 3. c. 19. Hic ipse (Spiritus) & in Prophetis populum accusavit, & in Apostolis advocacionem gentibus præstitit. Nam illi ut accusarentur merebantur quia contempserant legem, & qui ex Gentibus credunt ut patrocinio Spiritus adjuventur merentur, quia ad Evangelicam pervenire gestiunt legem, Novatianus de Trinit. cap. 39. And again; Quoniam Dominus in celos esset abiturus, Paracletum

Z z

Fourthly,

Fifthly, it is the Office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of Sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. *“The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”* ^d For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. And *“because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, trying Abba Father. For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear;”* ^e but we have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit it self bearing witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our Regeneration, so we are also assured by the same spirit of our Adoption: and because being sons we are also *“heirs, heirs of God, and joynt heirs with Christ,”* by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For ^h he which establisheth us in Christ and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts; so ⁱ that we are sealed with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance untill the redemption of the purchased possession. The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge; as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due; yet is to be looked upon as an [†] earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, y useth in this particular, is of an Hebrew extraction; שבו from כבד a word of promise and

a I *Ioh.* 3. 24.
b I *Cor.* 6. 17.
c *Rom.* 5. 5.
d *Rom.* 8. 14.
e *Gal.* 4. 6.
f *Rom.* 8. 15,
16.
g *Rom.* 8. 17.
h 2 *Cor.* 1. 22.
i *Eph.* 1. 14:

† The word
ἀπαρά which
the Apostle uses

engagement in commerce, bargaines, and agreements; and being but in one particular affair used in the old Testament, is taken for a pledge, Gen. 38. 17, 18, 20. and translated ἀρραβών by the LXX. as well as ἀρραβών by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwise, consonantly enough to the origination, signifieth rather an earnest then a pledge, as the Greeks and Latines generally agree. Hesych. Ἀρραβών, ἀρραβών, Etym. Ἀρραβών, ἡ δὲ τὰς αἰῶνι παρὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδομένη ἀρραβὼν ἀρραβών. Which words are extant also in Suidas, but corruptly. To this purpose is cited that of Menander, Μικρὸν ἀρραβὼν μὲν ἵππον ἰσθι κατακαλόν. So Aristotle speaking of Thales, ἰσοποσίστα χρημάτων ὄντων ἀρραβῶνας διαδοῦναι τὴν ἰλαυρίαν. Polit. l. 1. c. 11. So the Latines, Arrabo sic dicta ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum à Græco ἀρραβών. Reliquum ex eo quod debitum reliquit, Varro de L. L. lib. 4. In terrenis negotiis arthe quantitas, contractus illius pro quo intercesserit quædam portio est; pignoris vero ratio meritum rei pro qua poni videtur excedit. Paschasius Diaconus l. 1. de Sp. S. Pignus Latinus Interpres pro arrabone posuit. Non idipsum autem arrabo quod pignus sonat. Arrabo enim fururæ emptioni quasi quoddam testimonium & obligamentum datur. Pignus vero, hoc est, ὀψέσθην, pro mutua pecunia opponitur, ut cum illa reddita fuerit reddenti debitum pignus à creditore reddatur, S. Hieron. ad Ephes. 1. 14. There is such another observation in A. Gellius, upon these words of O. Claudius, Cum tantus arrhabo penes Samnites Populi Romani esset. Arrabonem dixit sexcentos obsoles, & id maluit quam pignus dicere, quoniam vis huius vocabuli in ea sententia gravior acriorque est, Noſt. Att. lib. 17. cap. 2. The sense and use of this word is evident in Plautus, Eas quanti desinat? Talentis magnis totidem, quot ego & tu sumus. Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadraginta minas, Mostellaria. The summe was 120. l. of which he gave 40. l. in part of payment, and this was the arrhabo. So the Greek Fathers interpret S. Paul, ἀτὰρ ἀρραβὼν ἡ ἐγγύη τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ μὲν ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν τὸ πᾶν. Theodoret 2 Cor. 1. 22. Οὐδὲ Πνεῦμα ἔστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἀλλ' ἀρραβὼν τῆς ἀγάπης, ἡ ἀπό τῆς χάριτος καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος δωρεῖται, S. Chrysost. In this manner speaks Eusebius. τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἁγία ὁ δὲ δὲν ἀρραβὼν ἐστίν. De vita Constant. l. 1. c. 3.

and, upon the condition of performance of the Covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

Sixtly, for the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the Office of the same Spirit to sanctifie and set apart Persons for the duty of the Ministry, ordeining them to intercede between God & his people, to send up prayers to God for them, to blesse them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the Gospel, to administer the Sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. The same Spirit which illuminated the Apostles, and endued them with power from above to perform personally their ApostolicaN functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive Ministry unto the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to take heed unto their selves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers to feed the Church of God. Eph. 4. 12. Acts 20. 28.

By these and the like means doth the Spirit of God sanctifie the Sons of men, and by virtue of this sanctification, proceeding immediately from his Office, he is properly called the Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the object of our faith contained in this Article, what is the Holy Ghost in whom we believe, both in relation to his * Nature, as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his Office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth first from the nature and condition of the Creed whereof it is an essential part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a Creed. For being the Creed is a Profession of that faith into which we are baptized, being the first Rule of Faith was derived from the sacred form of Baptisme, being we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of

* In respect of the nature of the Holy Ghost I have endeavored the same which Faustus Rhegiensis did, of whom Cennadius relates thus much;

Faustus ex Abbate Lirinenſis Monasterii apud regnum Galliarum Episcopus factus, vir in divinis Scripturis satis intentus, ex traditione Symboli occasione accepta, composuit librum de Spiritu S. in quo offendit eum juxta fidem Patrum, & consubstantialem & coeternalem esse Patri & Filio, ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinentem.

the Holy Ghost, we are obliged to profess faith in them three; that as they are distinguished in the Institution, so they may be distinguished in our profession. And therefore the briefest comprehensions of Faith have always included the Holy Ghost, and some* concluded with it.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, not only for the acknowledgement of the eminency of his Person, but also for a desire of the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the Apostle wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *a the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all.* For *b if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his;* if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him: if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; & *c no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; such is their felicity which have it; that which is born of the flesh is flesh; such is their infelicity which want it. what then is to be desired in comparison of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ; especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, *If ye being evil know how to give good*

* I have formerly shown at large how the Creed did first arise from the Baptismal Institution, p. 34. 35. And therefore as the name of the Holy Ghost is an essential part of that form, so must the belief in him be as essential to the Creed, which was at first no-

thing else but an explication of that form. The first enlargement and explication we find in Iustine Martyr, thus expressed, *Εὐ' ὁνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ ἐν' ὁνόματι τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ τελευτήσαντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Παύλου καὶ ἐν' ὁνόματι τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ διὰ τοῦ ὁμοῦς ὁμοιωμένου τὰς ἐν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πάσας τὰς ἐκ τῆς φύσεως αἰτίας, Apolog. 2.* And the Rule of Faith delivered soon after by Irenæus is very consonant unto it. *Εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα πασιπλάτορα τὸν ποιητὴν τὸν ἐρατὸν καὶ τὸν γιν, καὶ τὸς δυνάστεας καὶ πάσας τὰς ἐν αἰσίοις, καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκὸς ὄντα ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμαρτίας σωματικῆς, καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἄγιον τὸ διὰ τοῦ ὁμοῦς ὁμοιωμένον τὰς οἰκονομίας καὶ τὰς ἰσχύας, Adv. Hæres. lib. 1. cap. 2.* As that delivered soon after him by Tertullian, *Unum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione (quam oikonomia dicimus) ut Unici Dei sit & Filius Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, & sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum Hominem & Deum, filium hominis & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum Christum; Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepulcrum secundum Scripturas, resuscitatum à Patre, & in celos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. Qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam à Patre Spiritum S. Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem & Filium & Spiritum S. Adv. Prax. c. 2.* Indeed there is an Objection made against this truth by the Socinians, who would have us believe that in the first Creeds or Rules of faith the Holy Ghost was not included. Thus Schlittingius writing against Meiser. Potro observatum est à quibusdam tertiam hanc Symboli istius partem quæ à Sp. S. incipit, ab initio defuisse, seu in Symbolo non fuisse additam: idque non immerito, cum non personas ullas in quas credendum sit, (quas solas, ut apparet, auctoribus Symboli commemorare propositum fuit) sed res tantum credendas complectatur, quæ implicite fide in Deum & in Jesum Christum omnes continentur. Hoc si ita est sane defuit tertia Persona, quæ Deum illum unum nobis declarat. Tertullianus sane author antiquissimus & temporibus Apostolorum proximus, hanc tertiam Symboli istius partem non tantum ita non apposuit, ut omitteret; sed ita ut excluderet. lib. de Virginibus velandis. But as he argues very warily with his. Hoc si ita est, so he disputes most fallaciously. For first he makes Tertullian the most ancient and next to the Apostles, and so would bring an example of the first Creed from him, whereas Iustine Martyr and Irenæus were both before him, and they both mention expressly the Holy Ghost in their Rules of faith. Secondly he makes Tertullian exclude the Holy Ghost from the Rule of faith, which he clearly expresseth in the place forecited: and therefore that place by him mentioned cannot be an exclusion, but an omission onely, and the cause of that omission in that place is evident, that he might bring in his opinion of the Paracletus with the better advantage. Thus when Eusebius Cæsariensis gave in a Copy of the Creed (by which he was catechized, baptized and consecrated,) to the Council of Nice, it runs thus, *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα, &c; καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, &c. μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐν Πνεύμα ἄγιον, and there concludes. In conformity whereunto the Nicene Council, altering some things and adding others against the Arians, concludeth in the same manner, *Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐν Πνεύμα ἄγιον, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αἰώνιᾳ. From whence it appeareth that the Profession of Faith in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost was counted essential to the Creed, the rest which followeth was looked upon as a *συνέκδημα*. Quid nunc de Spiritu Sancti diemus quem credere consequente Symboli parte in Trinitate præcipimus? Alci Arius Serm. de Symbolo.**

a 2 Cor. 13. 14. b Rom. 8. 9. c 1 Cor. 12. 3.

gifts

gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

Thirdly, it is necessary to professe faith in the Holy Ghost. that the will of God may be effectually in us, even our sanctification. For if God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit; if we be elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called Holy because he is to sanctifie us, how should we follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? how should we endeavour to cleanse our selves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the spirit of God dwelleth in us; for the inhabitation of God is a consecration; and that place must be a temple where his honour dwelleth. Now if we know that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost within us which we have of God, if we know that we are not our own, for that we are bought with a price; we must also know that we ought therefore to glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's. Thus is it necessary to believe in the Spirit of sanctification, that our hearts may be established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints.

Fourthly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. We read of the Disciples at first, that they were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost; and those which afterwards became followers of them and of the Lord, received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost. These are the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth; this is the oyl of gladness wherewith the Son of God was anointed above his fellows, but yet with the same oyl his fellows are anointed also: for we have an unction from the Holy one, and the anointing which we receive of him abideth in us.

Lastly, the belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive Ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. For as God the Father sent the Son, and the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the Gospel, so the Son sent the Apostles, saying, As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost: and as the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others by the virtue of the same Spirit, as S. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, Lay hands suddenly on man, and to Titus, For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee. Thus by virtue of an Apostolicall Ordination there is for ever to be continued a Ministeriall succession. Those which are thus separated by Ordination to the work of the Lord, are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof; and those which are committed to their care, are to remember and obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their soules as they that must give account.

Having

1 Thess. 4. 3.

2 Thess. 2. 13.

1 Pet. 1. 2.

Heb. 12. 14.

2 Cor. 12. 1.

1 Cor. 3. 16.

17.

1 Cor. 3. 16.

1 Cor. 6. 19.

20.

1 Thess. 3. 13.

Rom. 14. 17.

Acts 13. 52.

1 Thess. 1. 6.

John 7. 38.

Psal. 45. 7.

Heb. 1. 9.

1 John 2. 20.

27.

Luke 4. 18.

Job. 20. 21, 22.

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Tit. 1. 5.

1 Pet. 5. 2.

Heb. 13. 7, 17.

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this Article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to professe, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I freely and resolvedly assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a person, of a true reall and personall subsistence, not a created but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternall God; that though he be that God, yet is he not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: I believe this infinite and eternall Spirit to be not onely of perfect and indefectible holinesse in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holinesse in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed Apostles, and inabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetuall succession to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of Sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions by all wayes and means purifying and sanctifying their soules and bodies, to a full and eternall acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternall Spirit of God; in this manner is that Spirit holy; and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost*.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE IX.

The holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints.

IN this ninth Article we meet with some variety of position, & with much addition, for whereas it is here the ninth, in some Creeds we find it the * last, and whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented; the most Ancient professing no more then to believe † *the Holy Church*,

* Although generally the Article of the Holy Church

did immediately follow the Article of the Holy Ghost, as Tertullian well observes, Cum sub tribus & testatio fidei & sponso salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia quæ trium corpus est, De Baptismo, c. 6. and the Author of the first book de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Sequitur post S. Trinitatis commendationem S. Ecclesia, and S. Ierome cited in the next Note. Yet notwithstanding this order was not always observed, but sometimes this Article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of S. Cyprian. Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum S. ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in Interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare; sciat quisquis & hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem Peccatorum & vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, cum non habeant Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi consiteptur remissionem peccatorum non dari nisi per Sanctam Ecclesiam, Epist. ad Magnum. Thus Arius and Euzoius, in the words hereafter cited, place the Church in the conclusion of their Creed. And the Author of the second book De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, placeth the Remission of sins after the Holy Ghost, Noli injuriam facere ei qui te fecit, ut consequaris ab illo quod in isto S. Symbolo sequitur, Remissionem omnium peccatorum: and after he hath spoken of the Resurrection and life everlasting, proceedeth thus to speak of the Church, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur autoritas, &c. The Author of the third, Ideo Sacramenti hujus conclusio per Ecclesiam terminatur, quia ipsa est mater fecunda. And the Author of the fourth, Per sanctam Ecclesiam. Propterea hujus conclusio Sacramenti per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit à numero filiorum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem. Thus therefore they disposed the last part of the Creed, Credo in Spiritum S. peccatorum remissionem, carnis resurrectionem & vitam æternam per S. Ecclesiam. And the designe of this transposition was to signifie that remission of sins, and resurrection to eternall life, are to be obtained in and by the Church. As the Creed in the first Homily under the name of S. Chrysostome, Credo in Spiritum S. Iste Spiritus perducit ad S. Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam.

† So Rufinus, Sanctam Ecclesiam. For Catholicam is added by Pamelinus. So S. Ierome contra Lucifer. Præterea cum solenne sit in lavacro post Trinitatis Confessionem interrogare, Credis Sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? Quam Ecclesiam credidisse eum dices? Arianorum? sed non habent: nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit; and S. August. De Fide & Symb. Credimus & sanctam Ecclesiam, with this declaration, utique Catholicam. So Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. and Venantius Fortunatus. The Author of the first Book de Symb. ad Catechum. Sequitur post Sanctæ Trinitatis commendationem Sancta Ecclesia. The Author of the other three, who placeth this Article last of all, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur autoritas, l. 2. and l. 4. expressly Per Sanctam Ecclesiam, as the words of the Creed with the explication before mentioned. As also the Interrogation of the Novatians ending with per Sanctam Ecclesiam, cited before out of Saint Cyprian. So likewise of those two Homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to S. Chrysostome, the first hath Sanctam Ecclesiam after the Belief in the Holy Ghost, the second concludeth the Creed with per Sanctam Ecclesiam. In Carnis resurrectione fides, in vita æterna spes, in Sancta Ecclesia charitas. Thus the Ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus, Thahalgan gelathing, i. e. the holy Church; the Greek Creed in Saxon letters in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and the old Latine Creed in the Oxford Library. Deus qui in cœlis habitat, & condidit ex nihilo ea quæ sunt, & multiplicavit propter Sanctam Ecclesiam suam, irascitur tibi, Hermas, l. 1. Visioe 1. Virtute sua potenti condidit Sanctam Ecclesiam suam, ib. Rogabam Dominum ut Revelationes ejus quas mihi ostendit per Sanctam Ecclesiam suam confirmaret, Vis. 4. But though it were not in the Roman or Occidental Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Oriental, particularly in that of Hierusalem, and that of Alexandria. In the Creed at Ierusalem it was certainly very ancient, for it is expounded by S. Cyril Archbishop of that place, ἐς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. And in the Alexandrian it was as ancient, and

for Alexander Archbishop of that place inserts it in his Confession, in his Epistle ad Alexandrum. *πιστι καὶ ὁμολογίᾳ τῷ Ἀποστολικῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Theodoret. Hist. l. 2. c. 4. And Arius and Euzoios in their Confession of faith given in to Constantine thus conclude, *καὶ εἰς καθολικὴν ἑκκλησίαν ᾧ Θεῷ, τὴν ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἡμῶν πατρὶν*, Socrates Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 26. The same is also expressed in both the Creeds, the lesser and the greater, delivered by Epiphanius in Ancoratos; the words are repeated in the next Observation.

and the Greeks having added by way of explication or determination, the word *Catholic*, it was at last received into the Latine Creed.

To begin then with the first part of the Article, I shall endeavour so to expound it, as to shew what is the meaning of the Church, which Christ hath propounded to us, how that Church is *holy*, as the Apostle hath assured us, how that holy Church is *Catholic*, as the Fathers have taught us. For when I say *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church*, I mean that * there is a Church which is holy, and which is Catholic, and I understand that Church alone which is both Catholic and holy: and being this holiness and Catholicism are but affections of this Church which I believe, I must first declare what is the nature and notion of the Church, how I am assured of the existence of that Church, and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

* Credo sanctam Ecclesiam, I believe there is an holy Church; or Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam, is the same: nor does the particle in added or subtracted make any difference. For although some of the Latine and Greek Fathers presse the force of that Preposition, as is before observed, though Rufinus urge it far in this particular.

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominall definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, *Church* or *Kirk*, it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is of Christ, and from thence was taken to signify the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The Greek word used by the Apostles to expresse the Church, signifieth: *a calling forth*, if we look upon the origination; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully expresse the nature of the Church, what it is in it self, and as it is propounded to our belief.

Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate divinitas doceatur, sicut dictum est in Deo Patre credi adjecta præpositione, ita & in Christo Filio ejus, ita & in Spiritu S. memoratur. Sed ut manifestius fiat quod dicimus, ex consequentibus approbabitur. Sequitur namque post hunc sermonem, *Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem*. Non dixit, in sanctam Ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem, si enim addidisset in præpositionem, una eademque vis fuisset cum superioribus. Ne autem (f. Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, & Jesu Christo Filio ejus, & in Spiritu S. in cæteris vero ubi non de divinitate sed de creaturis ac mysteriis sermo est, in præpositio non additur ut dicatur in sanctam Ecclesiam, sed sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse, non ut in Deum sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam; & remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum, & resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque præpositionis syllaba creator à creaturis secernitur & divina separantur ab humanis, *Ruff. in Symb.* Though I say, this expression be thus pressed; yet we are sure that the Fathers did use it: and in for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already produced the authorities of S. Cyril, Arius & Euzoios, p. 18. 19. and that of Epiphanius in Ancorato. Thus also the Latines, as S. Cyprian; In æternam poenam sero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt, *Ad Demetrianum*. So *Interpres Irenæi*, Quotquot autem timent Deum, & credunt in adventum Filii ejus, &c. So *Chrysost.* In sanctam Ecclesiam. Quia Ecclesia in Christo, & in Ecclesia Christus est, qui ergo Ecclesiam fatetur, in Ecclesiam se confessus est credidisse, *Serm. 62.* And in the ancient editions of S. Jerome in the place before cited it was read *Credis in Sanctam Ecclesiam, and the word in was left out by Victorius.* *Κύριος* the Lord, and that properly Christ; from whence *Κυριακή* belonging to the Lord Christ, & *Κυριακή* the Lord's house, from thence *Kyriac*, *Kyrke*, and *Church*. The word used by the Apostles is *ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλεῖν* evocare. From *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι*, *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι*; from *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι*, *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι*, of the same notation with the Hebrew *קריה*, ecclesia quippe ex vocatione appellata est, *S. Aug. Exp. ad Rom.* And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signify convocatio, as *S. Aug.* Inter congregationem, unde *synagoga*, & convocationem, unde *Ecclesia*

Our

nomen habet, distat aliquid, *Enar. in Psal. 177.* yet the Origination speaks onely of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in *ἐκκλησία*. From whence arose that definition of *Methodius*, "Ὁν Ἐκκλησίαν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκκλησιάζουσιν ἰδοῦναι ληγεται φωνή", *Photius Biblioth.* Whereas *ἐκκλησία* is here no more then *κλῆρις*, *ἐκκλησίαι* no more then *κλήσεις*; as *κλήσιν* and *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν* with the Atticks were the same; From whence it came to passe that the same preposition hath been twice added in the composition of the same words; from *ἐκκλησίαν ἐκκλησίαν* from thence *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν*, and because the preposition had no signification in the use of that word, from thence *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν*, to convocate, or call together. But yet *ἐκκλησία* is not the same with *ἐκκλησίαι*; not the evocation or the action of calling, but the *κλήσις*, or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν* is to gather together, or to be gathered. Hence *S. Cyril*, *Ἐκκλησία ἡ κληθεὶς οὐρανίου, διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ συναγαγεῖν*, catech. 18. So *Ammonius*, *Ἐκκλησία ἡμερὶν οἱ Ἀδελφοὶ τῆς Συνόδου τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει*. To this purpose doe the LXX. use *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν* actively, to convocate or call together an Assembly, as *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν λαόν*, and *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν συναγωγὰς*, and *ἐκκλησιάζουσιν* passively, as *ἐκκλησιάζου πάσα ἡ συναγωγή*, which the Attick writers would have expressed by *ἐκκλησιάζει*, as *Aristophanes*, "Ἐδὲ μὲν περὶ τὸν ὕμνον τῆς πόλεως Ἐκκλησιάζουσιν ποσὶ καὶ οὐκ ἐνδύμας, *Vespis.* Where though the Scholiast hath rendred it *Ἐκκλησιάζουσιν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγεῖν*, whereby the Lexicographers have been deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Atticks use it. Howsoever from the notation of the word we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the masse or generality of mankind; first, because the preposition *ἐκ* hath no such force in the use of the word; secondly, because the collection or coming together is not specified in the origination.

Our second Observation is, that the Church hath been taken for the whole complex of men and Angels worshipping the same God; and again, the Angels being not considered, it hath been taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the foundation of the world. But being Christ took not upon him the nature of Angels, and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood, or call them by his word, being they are not in the Scriptures mentioned as parts or members of the Church, nor can be imagined to be built upon the Prophets or Apostles, being we are at this time to speak of the proper notion of the Church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending any more then the sons of men. Again, being though Christ was the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and whosoever from the beginning pleased God, were saved by his blood; yet because there was a vast difference between the severall dispensations of the Law and Gospel, because our Saviour spake expressly of building himself a Church when the Jewish Synagogue was about to fail, because Catholicisme, which is here attributed unto the Church, must be understood in opposition to the legall singularity of the Jewish nation, because the ancient * Fathers were generally wont to distinguish between the Synagogue and the Church, therefore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.

3^{ly}. Therefore I observe that the onely way to attain unto the knowledge of the true notion of the Church, is to search into the New Testament, and from the places there which mention it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will be necessary to take notice that our Saviour first speaking of it, mentioneth it as that which then † was not, but afterwards was to be; as when he spake unto the

* Thus *S. Ignatius* speaking of Christ, *Ἀλλὰ ἐν δούλῳ τοῦ Πατρὸς, δι' ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαν*. *A. C. 34.* καὶ ἡ συναγωγὴ Ἰακώβ, καὶ οἱ Περσῆται, καὶ οἱ Ἀρμένιοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία. *Epist. ad Philadelph.* Where

ἡ ἐκκλησία is plainly taken for the multitude of Christians who were converted to the Faith by the Apostles, and those who were afterwards joyned to them in the profession of the same Faith. *Sacrificia in populo, sacrificia & in Ecclesia, Iren. l. 4. c. 34.* Disseminaverunt sermonem de Christo Patriarchæ & Propetæ, demissa est autem Ecclesia, hoc est fructum percepit, *Id. l. 4. c. 24.* Quid Judaicus populus circa beneficia divina perfidus & ingratus? nonne quod a Deo primum recessit impatientiæ crimen fuit... *S. Impatientia etiam in Ecclesia hæreticos facit, S. Cypri. de Bono Patient.* Quis non agnoscat Christum reliquisse matrem Synagogam Judæorum veteri Testamento carnaliter adhærentem, & adhæsisse uxori suæ *S. Ecclesiæ, S. Aug. contra Faust. l. 12. c. 8.* Mater sponsi Domini nostri Jesu Christi Synagoga est; proinde nurus ejus Ecclesia... *Idem Enar. in Psal. 44.* † In quem tingueret... in Ecclesiam quam nondum Apostoli struxerant, *Tert. de Bapt. c. 16.*

Matth. 16. 18.

Acts 2. 41.

Acts 1. 15.

Acts 2. 42.

† Qualis es-
vertens atque
commutans
manifestam
Domini in-
tentionem
personaliter
hoc Petro
conferentem,

Super te, in-
quit, edificabo
Ecclesiam me-
am, & dabo tibi
claves, non
Ecclesiæ. Sic
enim & exi-
tus docet: in
ipso Ecclesia
extructa est,
id est per i-
psam, ipse cla-
vem imbuir,
vides quam.

Viri Israelitæ,
auribus man-
date quæ dico:
Iesum Nazare-
num virum à
Deo vobis de-
stinatum, & re-
liqua, Tertul.
de Pudicitia,
cap. 21. So
S. Basil. Eddic
παρὰ τὴν φωνὴν
ταύτης τοῦ αὐτοῦ
ἡρώδης... & τὰ
τῆς ἡρώδης φωνῆς
ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ
τῆς οἰκονομίας
τῆς ἑκκλησίας
ἀπεδοκίμασαν,
Add. Eunom.

lib. 2. S. Peter
took upon him-
self the build-
ing of the
Church, that is
to build the
Church, which
he then per-
formed, when
he preached the
Gospel by which
the Church was
first gathered.

a Acts 1. 15.

b Acts 2. 38.

42. 47. ¶ Cum remississent summi Sacerdotes Petrum & Ioannem, & reversi essent ad reliquos coa-

postolos & Discipulos Domini, id est in Ecclesiam, S. Irenæus. l. 3. c. 3. c. Acts 4. 32. d. Acts 5. 14.

† Hæ voces Ecclesiæ, ex qua habuit omnis Ecclesia initium. S. Iren. ibid.

great Apostle, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church;* but when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when Peter had converted *three thousand souls* which were added to the *hundred and twenty* disciples, then was there a Church, (and that built upon † Peter, according to our Saviours promise,) for after that we read, *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.* A Church then our Saviour promised should be built, and by a Promise made before his death; after his Ascension, and upon the preaching of S. Peter, we find a Church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily encrease. We cannot then take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the Church of Christ, then by looking into the origination and encrease thereof.

Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a Church of Christ is only this. There were twelve Apostles with the Disciples, before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and ^a the number of the names together were an hundred and twenty. When the Holy Ghost came after a powerfull and miraculous manner upon the blessed Apostles, and S. Peter preached unto the Jews, that they should ^b repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. These being thus added to the rest, continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in break-
ing of bread and in prayers: and all these persons so continuing are called the **Church**. What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were Apostles, some the former disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the Sacraments administered, joyn-
ing in the publick prayers presented unto God. This was then the **Church**, which was daily encreased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up ^c the multitude of them that believed, who were of one heart and one soul, ^d belie-
vers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

But though the Church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one; & so the notion of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to expresse the nature of that Church which we believe; yet because that Church was one by way of † origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of severall Churches; and that Church which we believe, is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all Churches into it; it will be necessary to consider how at the first those severall Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one Church they are all united. To which purpose it will be further fit to examine the severall acceptions of this word as it is diversly used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament, that if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we colle& and conclude the full notion of the **Church** from thence,

First

First then that word which signifies the Church in the originall Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense, according as the native Greeks did use the same to expresse their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or Christ, and therefore is translated by the word *assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly, it is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek Translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the Assembly of the people of God under the Law, & therefore might be most fitly translated the *Congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, it has been conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the Church did meet to perform their solemn and publick services unto God, and some passages there are which seem to speak no lesse, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place. Beside these few different acceptions, the Church in the language of the New Testament doth alwayes signifie a company of persons professing the Christian Faith, but not alwayes in the same latitude. Sometimes it admitteth of distinction and plurality, sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the Churches of God are diversified as many; sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

For first in generall there are often mentioned *the Churches* by way of plurality, *the Churches of God*, *the Churches of the Gentiles*, *the Churches of the Saints*. In particular we find a few believers gathered together in the house of one single person, called a *Church*, as the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, the Church in the house of Nymphas, the Church in the house of Philemon; which Churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to joyn in the worship of the same God.

Again, when the Scripture speaketh of any Countrey where the Gospel had been preached, it nameth alwayes by way of plurality

Acts 19. 32.
39. 40.

Acts 8. 3.
Heb. 2. 12.

† Acts 11. 26.
1 Cor. 11. 18,
22. From these
places S. Aug.
did collect that
Eκκλησία was
taken in the
Scriptures for
the place of
meeting, or the
house of God,
and came so to
be frequently
used in the
language of
Christians in
his time. Sicut
Ecclesia dicitur
locus, quo
Ecclesia con-
gregatur.

Nam Ecclesia
homines sunt
de quibus di-
citur, *Et ex-
hiberet sibi glo-
riam Eccle-*

siam. Hanc tamen vocari etiam ipsam domum orationum idem Apostolus testis est, ubi ait, Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum & bibendum, Ecclesiam Dei contemnitis? Et hoc quotidianus loquendi usus obtinuit, ut, ad Ecclesiam prodire, aut ad Ecclesiam confugere, non dicitur, nisi quod ad locum ipsum parietesque prodierit, vel confugerit quibus Ecclesiae congregatio continetur, *Quaest. super Levit. l. 3. c. 57.* By these words it is certain that in S. Augustines time they used the word Ecclesia, as we do now the Church, for a place set apart for the worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek Church did use Eκκλησία in the same sense, as Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the persecution under Diocletian, says the Christians *μυθώμενοι ἐν τοῖς παλαιῖς οἰκοδομημένοις ἀκριβοῦς οὐ-
ρείας εἰς πλῆθος ἀνὰ πᾶσας τὰς πόλεις ἐν θεμελίῳ ἀνίσταντο ἐκκλησίας*, Hist. lib. 8. cap. 1. and S. Chrysostome, *Εἰ γὰρ ἐκκλησίαι κατὰ τὰς πόλεις καὶ ἀγροῖς, πολλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ πνευματικῶς, γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἐκκλησίας συμπίπτει*, Hom. 26. ad Rom. But it is not so certain that the Apostle used Eκκλησία in that sense, nor is it certain that there were any houses set apart for the worship of God in the Apostles times, which then could be called by that name. For Isidorus Pelseusiota expressly denies it, and distinguishes between Eκκλησία and Eκκλησιαστικόν, after this manner, *Ἄλλο ἐστὶν Eκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο Eκκλησιαστικόν, ἡ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἀμύμονι ἱερῷ συνίστηται, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ λῆθρον καὶ ζῴων οἰκοδομήσεται*. And thus he proveth this distinction, *Ὅτι γὰρ ἄλλο ἐστὶν συστατικόν καὶ ἄλλο συστάς, καὶ ἄλλο συμαρτήριον καὶ ἄλλο συμάριον, καὶ ἄλλο συλατήριον καὶ ἄλλο συλάς, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἢ πόνον ἢ ἢ συνδράσει μωρεῖας, ἢ τὸς βουλομένους ἀνδρεῖς, εἰς καὶ οὐ κήδυνον καὶ ἡ σωτηρία ἀνίκεται, ἐπὶ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Eκκλησιαστικῷ καὶ τῷ Eκκλησίᾳ*. Then he concludes that in the Apostles times there were no Eκκλησιαστικὰ, *Ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ, ἐπὶ Eκκλησία ἐκόντο μὲν καὶ οἱ πνευματικοί, ἔβρου δὲ πολιτεία λαμπρῶς, ἐκκλησιαστικὰ οὐκ ἦν*, Epist. 246. l. 6. *Acts 16. 5. 1 Cor. 14. 34. 2 Cor. 8. 19, 23, 24. 11. 8, 28. 12. 13. Revel. 22. 16. 1 Thessal. 1. 4. 1 Cor. 11. 16. Rom. 16. 4. 1 Cor. 14. 23.* Thus Origen for the most part speaks of the Church in the plural number αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. *Rom. 16. 5. 1 Cor. 16. 19. Col. 4. 15. Philem. 2. S. Chrysostome observeth of Priscilla and Aquila. Οὗτω γὰρ ὅταν ἰουδαῖοι αἰς καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκκλησίαν ποιοῦσι, οὐδὲ τὴν πᾶν-
τας ποιοῦσι πᾶσας, καὶ διὰ τὸ τοῖς ἑνοῖς αὐτὴν ἀνίστασθαι πᾶσιν*, Chrysost. Homil. 30. in Epist. ad Romanos.

* Gal. 1. 22.
 Acts 9. 31.
 1 Cor. 16. 1.
 19. Rev. 1. 11.
 1 Thess. 2. 14.
 2 Cor. 8. 1.
 Gal. 1. 2.
 a 1 Cor. 14. 34.
 1 Cor. 1. 2.
 * Acts 8. 1. 21.
 22. 13. 1. 15.
 3. 18. 22. 20.
 17. 2 Thess. 1. 1.
 Colof. 4. 16.
 Rev. 3. 14. 2. 8.
 12. 18. 3. 1. 7.
 And thus after
 they grew yet
 far more nu-
 merous in the
 time of Cle-
 mens Bishop of
 Rome.
 Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆ
 οὐσῆ, ἡ πατρι-
 στικὴ τῆ
 ἐκκλησίας τῆ
 οὐσῆ πατρι-
 στικῆς.
 Κόρινθον, Ep. 1.
 So after him
 Ignatius,
 τῆ ἐκκλησίας τῆ
 οὐσῆ μακαρί-
 τῆς ὁσῆς ὁσῆς
 τῆς Ἀσίας. And
 Ἐκκλησία ὁσῆς
 τῆ ὁσῆς Τετ-
 λασι, And so
 the rest.
 * Mat. 16. 18.
 1 Cor. 12. 28.
 15. 9.
 Gal. 1. 13.
 Eph. 1. 22. 3.
 10. 21. 5. 23.
 25. 27. 29. 32.
 Phil. 3. 6.
 Col. 1. 18. 24.
 Heb. 12. 23.
 Of this as of
 one Church cel-
 sus calls the
 Christians, τῆς
 οὐσῆς μακαρί-
 τῆς οὐσῆς, apud
 Orig. l. 5.
 † So the creeds
 of Epiphanius
 in Ancorato,
 τῆς οὐσῆς εἰς
 μίαν ὁσῆς κα-
 τὰ τὸν κατὰ Ἀ-
 ποστολὴν Ἐκ-
 κλησίαν. So
 the Jerusalem
 Creed in S. Cyril. Thus the Nicene with the additions of the Council of Constantinople, μίαν ὁσῆς κατὰ τὸν κατὰ Ἀποστολὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Thus also the Alexandrian, as appeareth by those already quoted of Alexander, Arius and Euzoius.

the * Churches of that Countrey, as the Churches of Judea, of Samaria and Galilee, the Churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Asia, the Churches of Macedonia. But notwithstanding there were severall such Churches or Congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the Scriptures alwayes speak of such congregations in the notion of one Church. As when S. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, * *Let your women keep silence in the Churches,* yet the dedication of his Epistle is, *Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth.* So we read not of the Churches, but the * Church at Jerusalem, the Church at Antioch, the Church at Cæsarea, the Church at Ephesus, the Church of the Thessalonians, the Church of Laodicea, the Church of Smyrna, the Church of Pergamus, the Church of Thyatira, the Church of Sardis, the Church of Philadelphia, From whence it appeareth that a collection of several congregations, every one of which is in some sense a Church, and may be called so, is properly one Church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in those great and populous Cities where Christians were very numerous, not onely all the several Churches within the Cities, but those also in the adjacent parts were united under the care and inspection of one Bishop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following the number of the Angels, that is, the Rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.

Now as severall Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the single Governour of those many Churches, so all the Churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one supreme Governour of them all, and that one Governour is Christ the Bishop of our souls. Wherefore the Apostle speaking of that in which all Churches doe agree, comprehendeth them all under the same appellation of one Church; & therefore often by the name of *Church* are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the Churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world. For the single persons professing faith in Christ are members of the particular Churches in which they live, and all those particular Churches are members of the Generall and Universall Church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the Church in the Creed which we believe, and which is in other Creeds expressly termed † *One, I believe in one holy Catholick Church.*

It will therefore be further necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Church which is thus one, to consider in what that Unity doth consist. And, being it is an aggregation not onely of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first Church again which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have been in a manner added and conjoynd, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by S. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles

doctrine,

doctrines, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers. These then were all built upon the same rock, all professed the same faith, all received the same Sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this Church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same Sacraments, by performing the same devotions.

Acts 2. 41,
42, 44, 47.

From whence it appeare h that the first unity of the Church considered in it self, beside that of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the originall of it, which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, it is not yet many but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the Church is built, and that is Christ: *for other foundation can no man lay, then that is layd, which is Iesus Christ.*

I Cor. 3. 11.

And though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner stone, whereby it comes to passe that such persons as are of the Church, being fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy Temple in the Lord. This stone was layd in Zion for a foundation, a tryed stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; there was the first Church built, and whosoever have been, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the unity of \dagger origination. Our Saviour gave the same power to all the Apostles, which was to found the Church; but he gave that power to Peter, to shew the unity of the same Church.

Eph. 2. 19, 20,
21.

1/4i. 28. 16.

Secondly, the Church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one faith. There is *one Lord, and one faith*, and that faith *once delivered to the Saints*, which whosoever shall receive, embrace and professe, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of believers become a Church by believing, they must also become one Church by be-

† *This is the
Unitas origi-
nis which
S. Cyprian so
much insists
upon, Ecclesia
una est quæ
in multitudi-
nem latius in-
cremento fœ-
cunditatis ex-
tenditur; quo-
modo Solis*

multi radii, sed lumen unum; & rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum. Et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copię largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, &c. *S. Cypr. de Unitate Eccl.* Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum. *Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, &c.* Et eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, *Pasce oves meas.* Et quamvis Apostoli omnibus post resurrectionem suam pariter potestatem tribuat, & dicat, *Sicut misit me Pater, & ego mitto vos, &c.* tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem ea auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique & ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi, & honoris & potestatis, sed exordia ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur, *Ibid.* Ένός ἐστι καὶ Θεός, καὶ ἑνὸς τὸ Κυρίον, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀρχὴν καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἐκκλησίαν κτισθῆναι, ὡς ἐν τῇ πατρὶ, *Clem. Alexand. Stromat. lib. 7.* *This is very much to be observed, because that place of S. Cyprisan is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one Head of the Church upon earth, and to shew that the Bishop of Rome is that one Head by virtue of his Succession to S. Peter, whereas S. Cyprisan speaks nothing of any such one Head, nor of any such succession, but only of the Origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ that the Unity might be expressed. For whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honour with S. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to S. Peter, to shew the Unity of the Church which he intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles. a Ephes. 4. 5. Inde 3.*

lieving

believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one, if we look upon Christ, which is mediately one, if we look upon the Apostles united in one corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles, because they believe the doctrine which the Apostles preached, and the Apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner-stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they receiv'd from Christ, then they which believe the same doctrine delivered by Christ to all the Apostles, delivered by all the Apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church. And this is the † Unity of Faith.

† of this doth
Irenæus speak,
delivering the
summe or brief
abstract of the
material Ob-
ject of Faith,

τὸ κρυπτό πα-
ρεκλήθη τὸ ταύ-
τῳ τῷ πιστῷ ἢ
Ἐκκλησίᾳ, καί-
παρ' ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ
κόσμῳ διανοη-
τὸν ὁππιαύτως
φύλασσαι, ὡς ἴ-
να εἴπωσι οἱ κῆ-
ρὲς, ὡς μίαν
ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν
αὐτὴν ἔχουσαν
καρδίαν, καὶ συμ-
φώνως ταῦτα κα-
ρῶσαι καὶ διδά-
σκειν καὶ παρ-
εδιδόσαν ὡς ἐν
ἐνὶ μακροχρόνῳ,
Adv. Hæc. l. i.

Κατὰ τὴν οὐδ'
ὑπόστασιν, καὶ
τὰ τὴν ἰσότηταν,
κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν,
κατὰ τὴν ἑξουσίαν,
μόνῳ ἐν ἡμῶν
ἀλλ' τὴν ἀρχαίαν
καὶ καθολικὴν
Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς
ἐνὶ ταῖς πίστει
μίας αἵ καὶ τὰς
ἰδέας διαθήκας,
μὴ μόνον καὶ τὴν
διαθήκην τὴν
μίαν διαδέχεται
τοὺς χεῖροισι, ἀλλ'
καὶ οὗτος τὸ ἐκ-
κλησιαστικόν, δι' ὅτι
τὴν Κερίαν ὡσαύ-
τως καὶ τὴν
καταστάσιν αὐτῆς,
ὡς περιέχεται ὁ
Θεός, ὁμοῦς
ἰσομῶντες μετὰ κα-
ταβολῆς κόσμου
ἰζνυμένους.

Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. 7. This unity of Faith followeth the unity of origination, because the true faith is the true foundation, Si qua est Ecclesia quæ fidem respuat, nec Apostolicæ prædicationis fundamenta possideat, deferenda est. Petra tua Christus est, S. Ambros. in Luc. lib. 2. cap. 9. Ἡ γὰρ σωτηρία τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως ἐστίν, Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. 2. S. Jerome in those words of the Psalm, 22. 11. Hæc est generatio quærentium Dominum, hath this observation. Superius singulariter dixit. Hic accipiet benedictionem; modo pluraliter, quia Ecclesia ex pluribus personis congregatur, & tamen una dicitur propter unitatem fidei. a Matth. 28. 19. b Ephes. 4. 4. c 1 Cor. 10. 17. d 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3, 4. e Ephes. 4. 4. f Galat. 5. 5. g Eph. 4. 3. h John 13. 35.

Thirdly, many persons and Churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same Sacraments, the signes and badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this Commission. ^a *Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but ^b one Lord, and one faith, so also is there but one Baptisme; and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, at the institution of the Lords supper, Christ commanded saying, *Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this*, and all by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. ^c *For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* As therefore the ^d Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spirituall meat, and did all drink the same spirituall drink, and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons, and all Churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of Regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same Church. And this is the Unity of the Sacraments.

Fourthly, whosoever belongeth to any Church is some way called, and all which are so, are ^e called in one hope of their calling: the same reward of eternall life is promised unto every person, and we all ^f through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. They therefore which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, the hope of Eternall life, which God that cannot lye, promised before the world began, having all the same expectation, may well be reputed the same Church. And this is the unity of hope.

Fifthly, they which are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members howsoever different, yet being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastning and uniting nature, nor can we call those many, who ^g endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. ^h By this, said our Saviour, shall all men know that ye

are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. And this is the † Unity of Charity.

Lastly, all the Churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastorall guides appointed, authoris'd, sanctified and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternall salvation: as therefore there is * no Church where there is no Order, no Ministry; so where the same Order and Ministry is, there is the same Church. And this is the .∴ Unity of Regiment and discipline.

By these means and ** for these reasons, millions of persons, and multitudes of congregations are united into one body, and become one Church. And thus under the name of Church expressed in this Article, I understand a body, or collection of humane persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in severall places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the Church as such, which is here the object of our faith; it remaineth therefore that we next consider the existence of the Church; which is acknowledged in the act of faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, *I believe a Church*, it is not onely an acknowledgement of a Church which hath been, or of a Church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say, *I believe in Christ dead*, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not: for Christ once dyed, but now is not dead. When I say, *I believe the resurrection of the body*, I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of Faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past, to what is to come, as still to come, to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past when the Creed was made, must necessarily be alwayes past, and so believ'd for ever; that which shall never come to passe untill the end of the world, when this publick profession of faith shall cease, that must for ever be believ'd as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is propos'd to our belief in every age as being; and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church it self, as being, was the object of the faith of the Church believing.

The existence therefore of the Church of Christ (as that Church before is understood by us,) is the continuation of it in an actuall being, from the first collection in the Apostles times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the Article, it will be necessary to prove that the Church which our Saviour founded and the Apostles gathered, was to receive a constant and perpetuall accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actuall existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded onely upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of

† Unus Deus enim & Christus unus, Ecclesia ejus una, fides una, & plebs in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata, S. Cypr. de Unitate Ecc.

* Ecclesia non enim quæ non habet Sacerdotes, S. Hier. adv. Lucifer. Πάντες ἐκπεριέχονται τῆς Διακονῆς αἱ ἁγίαι Χεῖρες, καὶ τὸν Ἐπισκοπὸν αἱ Πατρίαι, τὰς ὁποῦντες αἱ ἑκκλησίαι διὰ τῆς συνδικασμένης Ἀποστολῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ignat. ad Trall.

** Episcopatus unus est cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur; Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur, S. Cypr. ibidem. So he joynes these two together, Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordie numero sitate diffusus. Ep. ad Antonianum.

** These are all expressed by Tertullian,

Una nobis & illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta; semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus, de Virg. veland. cap. 2. Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, & disciplinæ unitate, & spei fœdere, Apolog. cap. 39.

the

the perpetuity of this Church, but what we have from him that built it. The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve it self for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the Church. Many particular Churches have been wholly lost, many candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue it self more or longer then others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the Universal Church must also be subject of it self unto the same defectibility.

But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular Churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When Christ spake first particularly to S. Peter, he sealed his speech with a powerfull promise of perpetuity, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* When he spake generally to all the rest of the Apostles, to the same purpose, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* he added a promise to the same effect, *and loe I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* The first of these promises assureth us of the continuance of the Church, because it is built upon a rock; for our Saviour had expressed this before, *Whoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.* The Church of Christ is the house of Christ, for he hath *builded the house*, and is as a *Son over his own house*, whose house are we; and as a *wise man*, he hath built his house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall. The latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ*, there he is in the *midst of them*; and thereby they become a Church; for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore being Christ doth promise his presence unto the Church, even to the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the Church, untill that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is *a the City of the Lord of hosts, the City of our God, God will establish it for ever*, as the great Prophet of the Church hath said.

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the Church hath been propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world: For those which are believers are the Church: and therefore if they doe be-

scio qui recedentes à me murmurant contra me? Quid est quod peritici me perisse contendunt? Certe enim hoc dicunt, Quia fui & non sum. Annuncio mihi exiguitatem dierum meorum. Non à te quæro illos dies æternos; illi sine fine sunt, ubi ero, non ipsos quæro; temporales quæro, temporales dies mihi annuncia. Exiguitatem dierum meorum, non æternitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi. Quam diu ero in isto sæculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos qui dicunt. Fuit & jam non est: propter illos qui dicunt, Implete sunt Scripturæ, crediderunt omnes gentes, sed apostatavit & perit Ecclesia de omnibus gentibus. Quid est hoc, Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi? Et annuntiavit, nec vacua fuit vox ista. Quis annuntiavit mihi nisi ipsa via? Quomodo annuntiavit? Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi. Concione secunda in Psalm. 101. a Psalm. 48. 8. Forte ista Civitas, quæ mundum tenuit, aliquando evertetur, Absit. Deus fundavit eam in æternum. Si ergo Deus fundavit eam in æternum, quid times ne cadat firmamentum? S. Aug. ad locum.

lieve,

lieve, they must believe there is a Church. And thus having shewed in what the nature of a Church consisteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetuall and indefectible existence, by virtue of the promises of Christ, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the Article, *I believe the Church.*

After the consideration of that which is the subject in this Article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof; which are two, Sanctity and Universality; the one attributed unto it by the Apostles, the other by the Fathers of the Church: by the first the Church is denominated *Holy*, by the second *Catholic*. Now the Church which we have described, may be called holy in severall respects, and for severall reasons; First, in reference to the Vocation by which all the members thereof are called, and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation in the language of the Scriptures is a sanctification: and so the calling being holy, (for *God hath called us with an holy calling*;) the body which is separated and congregated thereby, may well be termed *holy*. Secondly, in relation to the offices appointed, and the powers exercised in the Church, which by their institution and operation are holy, that Church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called *holy*. Thirdly, because whosoever is called to professe faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the Apostle, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity*: for those namers of the name or named by the name of Christ, are such as called on his name, and that was the description of the Church; as when Saul did persecute the Church, it is said he had *authority from the chief Priests to bind all that call'd upon the name of Christ*, and when he preached Christ in the Synagogues, all that heard him said, *Is not this he who destroyed them which called on his name in Jerusalem?* Being then all within the Church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation, the whole Church may be termed *holy*. Fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a Church in God, was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great designe thereof was for the begetting and encreasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which without a previous sanctification they can never approach, because *without holiness no man shall ever see God*.

For these four reasons the whole Church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed *holy*. But the Apostle hath delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the Church taken in so great a latitude. For, saith he, *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish*. Now though it may be conceived that Christ did love the whole Church as it did any way contain all such as ever call'd upon his name, and did give himself for all of them: yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy, as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the

great complex body of the Universall Church, to find that Church to which this absolute holinesse doth belong: and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the Church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holinesse is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the Church is *holy*.

Where first we must observe that the Church, as it embraceth all the professours of the true faith of Christ, containeth in it not onely such as doe truely believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites, and profane. Many professe the faith, which have no true belief: many have some kind of faith, which live with no correspondence to the Gospel preach'd. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For the Kingdome of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares grow together into the harvest; like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; like unto a floore in which are laid up wheat and chaff; like unto a marriage feast, in which some have on the wedding garment, and some not. This is that Ark of Noah in which were preferred beasts clean, and unclean. This is that great house in which there are not onely vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood, and of earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour. There are many called, of all which the Church consisteth, but there are few chosen, of those which are called, and thereby within the Church. I conclude therefore, as the ancient Catholicks did against the † Donatists, that within the Church, in the publick profession and externall communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned.

Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they passe out of this life, dye in their sins, and remain under the eternall wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were

Mat. 13. 24,
30, 47.

Mat. 3. 12.
Firmissime
tene & nulla-
tenus dubites
aream Dei
esse Ecclesi-
am Catholi-
cam, & intra
eam usque in
finem sæculi
frumento
mixtas paleas
contineri, hoc
est, bonis ma-
los sacramen-
torum com-
munionem mi-
sceri, Fulgent.
ad Petrum,
cap. 43.
Matth. 22. 10.
2 Tim. 2. 20.

S. Ierome joyns
these two toge-

ther, Arca Noë Ecclesiæ typus: ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita & in hac universarum & gentium & morum homines sunt, ut ubi pardus & hœdi, lupus & agni, ita & hic iusti & peccatores, id est, vasa aurea & argentea cum ligneis & fictilibus commorantur, Dialog. contra Luciferianos. † The Opinion of the Donatists confuted by the Catholicks is to be seen in S. Augustin's book intituled Breviculus Collationum. Upon which reflecting in his book Post Collationem, he observes how they were forced by the testimony of those Scriptures which we have produced to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad, Ecce etiam ipsi veritate Evangelica non aliud coacti sunt confiteri quam malos occultos nunc ei permixtos esse, as the good and bad fish are taken in the same net, because it could not discern the bad from the good. And from thence he inforceth from their acknowledgement, that those which are apparently evil, are contained in the same Church. Si enim propterea retribus bonos & malos congregantibus Ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in Ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid acceperint retia nesciunt Piscatores, Propterea ergo & aræ comparata est, ut etiam manifeste mali cum bonis in ea prænuntiarentur futuri. Neque enim palea quæ in arca est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluctibus latet, quæ sic omnium oculis est conspicua, ut potius occulta sint in ea frumenta, cum sit ipsa manifesta, Lib. post. collat. cap. 9, 10.

called,

called, and being by death separated from the external Communion of the Church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they dye are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internall union by which they were before conjoynd both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not only by an holiness of institution, but also by a personall sanctity in reference to these Saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same Saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the Church when the members of the Church remaining being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole Church be truly and perfectly holy.

Then shall that be compleatly fulfilled, that *Christ shall present unto himself a glorious Church, which shall be holy and without blemish.* Not that there are two Churches of Christ, one in which good and bad are mingled together, another in which there are good alone; one in which the Saints are imperfectly holy, another in which they are perfectly such; but one and the same Church, in relation to † different times, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly. To conclude, the Church of God is universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same Church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it, by a reall infused sanctity; the same is further yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the Saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same Church shall hereafter be most compleatly holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it, shall be at once perfected in holiness and compleated in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

The next affection of the Church is that of Universality, *I believe the holy CATHOLICK Church.* Now the word *Catholic*, as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already shewn) but being inserted by the Church, must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient Fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not used by the .^o. Apostles, we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the Primitive Fathers, and that as to severall intents. For first, they called the Epistles of S. James, S. Peter, S. John, S. Jude, the .^o. Catholic Epistles, because when the Epi-

† This was it which the Catholics answered to the Donatists, objecting that they made two distinct Churches. De duabus etiam Ecclesiis calumniam eorum Catholici refutarunt identidem expressius ostendentes quid dixerint, id est, non eam Ecclesiamque nunc habet permixtos malos alienam se dixisse à regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti, sed

eandem ipsam unam & sanctam Ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram, nunc habere malos mixtos, tunc non habituram, sicut nunc mortalem quod ex mortalibus constaret hominibus, tunc autem immortalem, quod in ea nullus esset vel corpore moriturus, sicut non ideo duo Christi, quia prior mortuus postea non moriturus, S. Aug. Collat. 3. diu.

.^o. It was the ordinary objection of the Schismaticall Novatians, that the very name of Catholics was never used by the Apostles, and the answer to it by the Catholics was by way of concession. Sed sub Apostolis, inquit, nemo Catholicus vocabatur; Esto, sic fuerit, vel illud indulge, &c. Pacianus ad Sympronianum, Epist. 1. .^o. So S. Jerome of S. James. Unam tantum scripsit Epistolam quæ de septem Catholicis est: Of S. Peter, Scripsit duas Epistolas quæ Catholicæ nominantur: Of S. Jude, Judas frater Jacobi, parvam quidem, quæ de septem Catholicis est, Epistolam reliquit. This therefore was the common Title of these Epistles in S. Jerome's time among the Latines, and before among the Greeke, as appeareth by Eusebius. Τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν Ἱεροσολιμίων, ἃ ἡ πόλις ἔχει, ὡς ἐκείνη τῶν Ἱεροσολιμίων, καὶ αὐτὴς ὅσους ἔχει τῶν Ἱεροσολιμίων, Hist. lib. 2. 23. The same was in use before the time of Eusebius, as appeareth by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, Οὗ ἐκείνη τῶν Ἱεροσολιμίων

lib. 7. *Invis Græcorum.* Where appeareth a manifest distinction of the Monastick, and the Catholick Churches. Hence Alexius Patriarch of Constantinople complaineth of such as frequented the private chappels, and avoided the common Churches, describing those persons in this manner, Πατριάρχης συνουσιῶν καὶ ἐπισκοπικῆς συνουσίης, τὰς καθολικὰς παρεκκλήσιας, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτοις συναΐσαν καταργουῦντες, lib. 4. *Invis Græcor.*

Again when the Church is taken for the persons making profession of the Christian faith, the *Catholick* is often added in opposition to hereticks and schismatics, expressing a * particular Church continuing in the true faith with the rest of the Church of God, as the Catholick Church in Smyrna, the Catholick Church in Alexandria.

Now being these particular Churches could not be named *Catholick* as they were particular, in reference to this or that City in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called *Catholick* by their coherence and conjunction with that Church which was † properly and originally called so; which is the Church taken in that acception which we have already delivered. That Church which was built upon the Apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by their baptizing, receiving continued accessions, and disseminated in severall parts of the earth, containing within it numerous Congregations, all which were truly called Churches, as members of the same Church; that Church, I say, was after some time called the *Catholick Church*, that is to say, the name *Catholick* was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For being every particular congregation professing the name of Christ, was from the beginning call'd a Church, being likewise all such Congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the Church, being these two notions of the word were different, it came to passe that for distinction sake at first they called the Church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the * *Catholick Church*.

* As the Smyr-
neans spake in
Eusebius of
Polycarpus,
ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν
Σμύρνῃ καθολικὴ
ἐκκλησία, lib. 4. cap. 15.

So καθολικὴ ἐκ-
κλησία ἡ ἐν Ἀλε-
ξανδρείᾳ, in
Epiphanius.

Thus Gregory
Nazianzene
begins his own
Last Will.

Γρηγόριος ἐπι-
σκοπὸς τῆς
καθολικῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας τῆς ἐν
Κωνσταντίνῃ πο-
λεως, in which
he bequeaths
his estate,
τῇ αἰγίᾳ καθο-
λικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
τῇ ἐν Ναζιανζῶν.
and subscribes
it after the

same manner in words in which he began it, and so the rest of the Bishops which subscribed, as witnesses. Ἀμφιλόχιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἰκονίᾳ. Οὐλίμπος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Ἀσίαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Θεόδωρος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Τέβη. Θεόδωρος τῆς αἰγίης καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Ἀπομεινί. Οὐμύς ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Ἀδριανουπόλιν. In the same manner speak the Latines. Eodem itaq; tempore in Ecclesia Hipponensi Catholica Valerius Sanctus Episcopatu gerebat. Possidius de Vita Augustini, c. 4. Thus any particular true Church is called the Catholick Church of the place in which it is, & all Churches which retain the Catholick faith, are called Catholick Churches. As when the Synod of Antioch concluded their Sentence against the Samosatensians thus, ἐπιστολῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Συμμενοστικῇ. According to which notion we read in Leo the great. Ad venerationem Pentecostes unanimiter incitemur exultantes in honorem S. Spiritus, per quem omnis Ecclesia Catholica sanctificatur, omnis anima rationalis imbuatur. Serm. 1. de Pentec. Whence where we read in the Synod of Ariminum, eis τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐπισκοπῶσι Cuiusmodi, ἵνα καὶ ἡ πίστις τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γνωρίζῃ, καὶ εἰ τὰ πάντα φερονούτε ἰσχυροὶ ἡρώων, although in Athanasius, Theodoret, and Socrates it be constantly written τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας; yet S. Hilary did certainly read it, τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, for it is thus translated in his Fragments, Ut fides claresceret omnibus Ecclesiis Catholicis, & hæretici noscerentur. From whence it came to passe that in the same City Hereticks and Catholicks having their severall congregations, each of which was called the Church, the Congregation of the Catholicks was by way of distinction called the Catholick Church. Of which this was the old advice of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ἄν ποτὶ τῶνδ' ἡμῶν ἐν πόλεσι, μὴ ἀπλῶς ἕσταξε πρὸ τῷ Κυριακῷ ἵερῷ καὶ γὰρ αἱ λαοὶ αὐτῶν αἰσίου Κυριακὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σήματα καλῶν ἐπιχειροῦσι· μὴδὲ πρὸ ἑσθ' ἀπλῶς ἐκκλησίας ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἑσθ' ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, Catech. 18. Ego forte ingressus populosam urbem hodie cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinaricos, Cataphrygas, Novatianos, & ceteros ejusmodi comperissem, qui se Christianos vocarent, quo cognomine congregationem meam plebis agnoscerem nisi Catholica diceretur? Pacianus ad Sympron. Epist. 1. Tenet postremo ipsum Catholica nomen, quod non sine causa ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit, ut cum omnes hæretici se Catholicos dici velint, quærenti tamen peregrino alicui, ubi ad Catholicam conveniatur, nullus hæreticorum, vel Basilicam suam vel domum audeat ostendere, S. August. con. Epist. Fundamenti, cap. 4. † Nonne appellatione propria decuit caput principale signari? Pacianus ibid. * I conceive at first there was no other meaning in the word καθολικὴ then what the Greek language did signifie thereby, that is, tota or universa, as S. Austin, Cum dixisset de super contexta, addidit per totum. Quod si referamus ad id quod significat, nemo ejus est expers qui pertinere invenitur ad totum: à quo toto sicut Græca indicat lingua, Catholica vocatur Ecclesia. Tract. in Johan. 118.

Although

The most ancient Author which I find it in, (except Ignatius) Ὁπὺ ἀν φαιῖ ὁ ὁσιονος, ἐκ τὸ πρῶτον ἱστοῖ, ὡς περ ὅπου ἀν ἡ Χρῆστος Ἰησοῦς, ἐκείνῃ ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Ep. ad Smyrnaeos.) is Clement Alexandrinus, μὲντοι αὐτοῖς φαιδὸν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, Stromat. lib. 7. But the Passion of Polycarpus written in the name of the Church of Smyrna, may be much ancients, in which the Original notion seemeth most clear, Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῷ Θεῷ ἡ παρῆκεστα Σμύρνης τῇ παρῆκεστα Φιλομυλίᾳ, καὶ πάσαις καὶ πάντα τόποις τῆς ἀγίας Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παρῆκεστα, i. e. omnibus totius Ecclesiae paræciis, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4. 15. It was otherwise called in the same notion ἡ καθόλου. As Apollinarius Bishop of Hierapolis, Τὴν ἡ καθόλου καὶ πᾶσαι τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν ὁρανὶ ἐκκλησίαν βλάσφημοις διδάσκοντες, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδομένην ἀνὸς ἀνθρώπων, apud Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 16. And Eusebius, Περὶ τοῦ ὅτι αὐτῶν καὶ μὴ ἑκείνων ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδομένην ἔχουσαν ἡ τῆς καθόλου καὶ μόνῃς ἀλλοῦς ἐκκλησίας λαμβάνεται, Hist. l. 4. c. 7. Καθολικὴ then and ἡ καθόλου is the same, the whole, generall, or universal.

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name *Catholic* to the Church, to signifie thereby nothing else but the whole or universall Church, yet those which followed did signifie by the same that affection of the Church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole Church *Catholic*, meaning no more then the Universall Church; but having us'd that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be Universall, and in what that Universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient Fathers have exprest'd themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the Church delivered in the Scriptures, so far I conceive we may safely conclude that the Church of Christ is truly Catholic, and that the truly Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say, we believe the *Catholic Church*.

The most obvious and most generall notion of this Catholicisme consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the Commission given to the builders of it, *Goe teach all nations*, whereby they and their successors were authorized and impowred to gather congregations of believers, and so to extend the borders of the Church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The Synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the publick worship of God was confined to one Countrey, *In Judah was God known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his Tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Sion. He shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgements unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.* The Temple was the onely place in which the Sacrifices could be offered, in which the Priests could perform their office of ministration; and so under the law there was an inclosure divided from all the world beside. But God said unto his Son, *I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* And Christ commanded the Apostles, saying, *Goe ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.* Thus the Church of Christ, in it's primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend it self, from the City of Jerusalem, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation, crying to the Lamb, *Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.* This reason did the ancient Fathers render why the Church was called * *Catholic*, and the nature of the Church is so described in the Scriptures,

* we have before observed of Arius and

Euzoios, that naming the Catholic Church in their Creed, they gave withall the interpretation of it. Εὐαγγελιστὴς Καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδομένην ἡμῖν. S. Cyril of Jerusalem gives this as the first importance of the word. Καθολικὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδομένη ἡμῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τῇ οὐνὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδομένην ἡμῖν, Catech. 18. Ubi ergo erit proprietates Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationalis & ubique.

Secondly,

diffusa? *Optatus l. 2.* Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catholica: unde καθολικὴ Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem diffunditur, *S. Aug. Epist. 170.* Ecclesia illa est quam modo dixi unicam suam, hæc est unica Catholica quæ toto orbe copiose diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo potrigitur, *Idem Epist. 30.* Si autem dubitas quod Ecclesiam quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilatur, *S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate prolatis te onerabo, Idem contra Crescon. l. 1. c. 33.* Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa, *Isidor. de Summo Bono, lib. 1. cap. 9.*

Secondly, they called the Church of Christ the Catholick Church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whither they be things in heaven or things in earth, whither they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles into all truth, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which teaching all the same may well be called † Catholick, from the Universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it.

Thirdly, the Church hath been thought fit to be called Catholick in reference to the universall obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of * all conditions, and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of † all the Evangelicall commands.

Fourthly, ∴ the Church hath been yet further called or reputed Catholick, by reason of all graces given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spirituall virtues are disseminated, all the works, and words, and thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.

In all these four acceptions did some of the ancient Fathers understand the Church of Christ to be Catholick, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this Catholicisme, or second affection of the Church, consisteth generally in Universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces, in the soules of men.

The necessity of believing the holy Catholick Church, appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the onely way unto eternall life. We read at the first, that * the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be

† This is the second interpretation delivered by Saint Cyril, καὶ διὰ τὸ διδόναι καθολικῶς καὶ ἀπληρώτως ἀπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἰδιὴν ὁρί- λοῖα δὲ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρᾶ- γματικῶν ἱππα- ρίου τῆς ἐκ- γείας, Catech. 18. Ecclesia Græcum nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur Com- vocatio, pro- pterea quod ad se omnes vocet. Catho- lica (id est U- niversalis) i- deo dicitur

quia per universum mundum est constituta: vel quoniam Catholica, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem, *In Decret. Ivo. lib. 1.* * This is the third interpretation of S. Cyril, καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἰσοπέθειαν ὑποτάσσεν ἀρχήσαν τῇ καὶ ἀρχαίῳ λόγῳ τῇ καὶ ἰδιᾷ, Catech. 18.

† Si reddenda Catholici vocabuli ratio est, & exprimenda de Græco interpretatione Latina, Catho- licus ubique unum, vel (ut doctiores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatorum scilicet Dei. Unde Apostolus, *Si in omnibus obedientes estis*, & iterum, *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius pec- catores constituti sunt multi, sic per dicto-audientiam unius iusti constituentur multi*, Ergo qui Catholicus, idem iusti obediens, *Pacianus Epist. 1. ad Sympron.* Acutum aliquid videris dicere cum Catholice nomen non ex orbis totius communione interpretaris, sed ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum: quasi nos etiam, si forte hinc sit appellata Catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cujus veritatis nonnullæ particulæ etiam in diversis inveniuntur hæresi- bus, huius nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandam Ecclesiam in omnibus gentibus, & non promissis Dei & tam multis tamque manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remanuisse Rogatistas, qui Catholici recte appellandi sunt ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum, *S. Aug. Vincentio, Epist. 48.* Indeed this Notion of the Catholick Church was urged by the Donatists as the onely notion of it in opposition to the Universality of place and communion. For when the Catholics answered for themselves, Quia Ecclesiæ toto orbe diffusa, cui testimonium perhibet Scriptura divina, ipsi, non Donatistæ communicant, unde Catholici merito & sunt & vocantur: Donatistæ autem responderunt; Non Catholicum nomen ex universitate gentium, sed ex plenitudine Sacramentorum institutum, *Idem Collat. 3. diei cap. 2.*

∴ This is the fourth and last explication given by S. Cyril, ἀπὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρᾶματικῶν ἱππαρίου τῆς ἐκείνης, καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἰσοπέθειαν ὑποτάσσεν ἀρχήσαν τῇ καὶ ἀρχαίῳ λόγῳ τῇ καὶ ἰδιᾷ, Catech. 18, 2. 47.

fa-

Acts 4. 12.

Καθάπερ ἐν θα-
λάσσῃ ἡ σὺν εἰ-
σὶν αἱ ῥῆθ' οἰκί-
ται καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία
καρποφόρος ἔχη-
σαι ὅρμους καὶ λι-
μῆας ποιεῖ τὸ
τὸν χειμαζομέν-
ον ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυ-
τοῖς καταφυγὰς
ἢ τὸν δειδωκένον ὁ
Θεὸς τῷ πλάσματι
κοινωνοῦν καὶ
χειμαζομένῳ
καθ' ὅσον ἀναπα-
ρησθῆναι τὰς
συμφορὰς λε-
γομένης Ἐκκλη-
σίας, ἐν αἷς κα-
θάπερ λιμῶσιν
διόρμους ἐν νήσοις
αἱ διδασκαλίαι
τῆς ἀληθείας εἰ-
σὶ, παρὶς αἷς κα-
ταβύθασιν οἱ
διδόσκοντες καὶ
S. Theophil.
Antioch. ad.
Theol. l. 2.

saved; and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed to ways two heaven; nor did he build a Church to save some, and make another institution for other mens salvation. *There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,* but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven then in the Church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the Ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt liv'd, but such as were within those habitations whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a Covenant was made; so none shall ever escape the eternall wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the Tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the Temple.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Church of Christ which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast our selves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to cast those out which doe belong to it; for if any neglect to hear the Church, saith our Saviour, *let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a Publican.* By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the Church of God, and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his Apostles, upon whom he built his Church, *Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.* Again, a man may not onely passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may by an act of his own, cast out or reject himself, not onely by plain and complete Apostacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresie, or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable Schism.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the Church of Christ to be holy, least we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution and administration of the Church are holy: but, that there may be some reall and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness the privileges of the Church prove the greatest disadvantages, and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not onely vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment, and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry, *Lord, Lord, open unto us,* while we are without oyl in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness, when we confesse that Church alone which is holy can make us happy.

Fourthly, there is a necessity of believing the Catholick Church, because except a man be of that he can be of none. For being the Church which is truly Catholick containeth within it all which are truly Churches, whosoever is not of the Catholick Church, cannot be of the true Church. That Church alone which first began at Jerusalem on earth, will bring us to the Jerusalem in heaven; and that alone began there

Sola Catholica Ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei: quo si quis non intraverit, vel à quo si quis exierit, à spe vitæ æ salutis æternæ alienus est. *Lactantius, l. 4. c. 30.*

which

which alwayes embraceth *the faith once delivered to the Saints*. Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdome, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe *the holy Catholick Church*.

Having thus far explicated the first part of this Article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction, what they ought to intend, when they professe to believe *the Holy Catholick Church*. For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much; I am fully perswaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto himself a Church consisting of thousands of believing persons, and numerous congregations, to which he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and dayly add unto the same unto the end of the world: so that by the virtue of his allsufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be so long as the Sun and Moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same. This Church I believe in general holy in respect of the Author, end, institution and administration of it; particularly in the members here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy. I look upon this Church not like that of the Jews limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of Christ, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well pleasing in the sight of God. And thus I believe *the Holy Catholick Church*.

The Communion of Saints.

THis part of the Article beareth something a † later date than any of the rest, but yet is no way inferiour to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the Creed will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as it is placed in the Creed. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words as the sense of the Creed, than what was then understood by the Church of God, when they were first inserted.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the origi-

† These words *Communio-nem Sancto-rum*, were not in the *Aquileian Creed* expounded by *Ruffinus*; they were not mentioned by him, as being either in the *Oriental*

or the *Roman Creed*. They were not in the *African Creed* expounded by *S. Austin De Fide & Symbolo*, nor in the Creed delivered by *Maximus Taurinensis*; nor in any of the Sermons of *Chrysologus*; nor in any of the four Books *de Symbolo ad Catechumenos* attributed to *S. Austin*; nor in the 119. Sermon under his name *De Tempore*, *Cum dixerimus Sanctam Ecclesiam, adjungamus Remissionem peccatorum*. They are not in the *Greek Creed* in *Sir Robert Cotton's Library*, nor in the old *Latine Creed* in the *Oxford Library*, nor in that produced by *Elipandus*. We find them not in the old *Greek Creeds*, nor in that of *Eusebius* given in to the Council of *Nice*, nor in that of *Marcellus* delivered to the Bishop of *Rome*, nor in that of *Arius* and *Euzoius* presented to *Constantine*, nor in either of the Creeds preserved in the *Ancoratus* of *Epiphanius*, nor in the *Ierusalem Creed* expounded by *S. Cyril*, nor in that of the Council of *Constantinople*, nor in that of *Charisius* given in to the *Ephesine Council*; nor in either of the *Expositions* under the name of *S. Chrysostome*. It was therefore of a later date, and is found in the *Latine and Greek Copy* in *Bennet Colledge Library*, and is expressed and expounded in the 115. and 181. Sermon *de Tempore*, attributed to *S. Austin*, v. *Paschasii Symbolum*,

Acts 2.44, 45.

2 Cor. 8. 14, 15.

* As Grotius upon that place of the Corinthians observes Spectat & huc ea quam in Symbolo profiteamur Sanctorum communio-

nal condition of those persons which received the Gospel, how they were all together, and had all things common; how they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need, how S. Paul urged an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, He that had gather'd much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack: we might well conceive that the communion, (which word might be taken for communication) of the Saints, may signify the great * charity, bounty and community, among the people of God.

But being that community precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the Church; being I conceive this Article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past; and especially, being I think neither that custome, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church, when this communion of Saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which is attributed to the Saints both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now all communion being between such as are someway different and distinct, the communion of the Saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves; between them and others as differing from them either in their nature or their sanctity, between themselves, as distinct in person only, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who, or what kind of persons, these are which are called *Saints*, with whom beside themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the *Saints*, they have communion, and lastly in what the nature of that *Communion* in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of the *Communion of Saints*.

That we may understand what Communion the Saints have with others, it would be necessary first to consider what it is to be a *Saint*, in what the true nature of *Saintship* doth consist, by what the *Saints* are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what *Communion the Saints* have with or among themselves, it will be further necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true *Saints*, and thence conclude the *communion* between them all.

I take it first for granted, that though the Greek word which we translate *Saints*, be in it self as applicable to † things, as persons; yet in this Article it signifieth not holy things, but *holy ones*, that is, persons holy. Secondly, I take it also for granted, that the singular Holy one, the Holy one of Israel, the fountain of all sanctity, the sanctifier of all Saints, is not comprehended in the Article, though the communion of the holy ones with that singular, eminent, and transcendent * Holy one, be contained in it. Thirdly, I take it

† Κοινωνία ἀ-
ζίας may be as
well understood
in the Neuter
as the Mascul-
ine, as Exod.
28.38. Ἐξ ἁ-
ρτί Ἀαρὼν τὰ
ἁμαρτήματα τῆ
ἀζίας, that

Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things. So *Levit. 5. 15*. Καὶ ἀνελάτῃ ἀνομιὰς σου ἡ σὴν Κούρα. *Kugla*. 22. 2. Καὶ ὁμοιωσάτω σου ἡ σὴν Κούρα ἡ σὴν Ἰσραὴλ. *I Chron. 24. 5*. ἡ σὴν Κούρα, the Governors of the Sanctuary, of which notion afterwards. * This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testaments, קֹדֶשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is also sometimes translated plurally by the LXX, as *Esa. 41. 16*. בקדש וברא. ἡ σὴν Κούρα ἡ σὴν Ἰσραὴλ. *Ier. 31. 5*. בקדש וברא, ἡ σὴν Κούρα, and if it were so taken, then אֱלֹהֵינוּ ἡ σὴν Κούρα, would be the communion of God, as אֱלֹהֵינוּ ἡ σὴν Κούρα.

further

nothing else but that separation from and to those termes, from an use and exercise profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominatèd holy, and in some sense receive the name of *Saints*. The Pen-men of the Old Testament doe often speak of the people of Israel as of an holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to a people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true inherent and actuall sanctity, yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to that separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized, in the faith, give unto them all the name of *Saints*, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being baptisme is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect, therefore all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more then an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not onely by an extrinsecall denomination, but by a reall and internall affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of Christ, by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now by the tenure of the Gospel we shall find that those are truly and poperly Saints, which are sanctified in Christ Jesus; first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*; by which they are purged, God himself purifying their hearts by faith, whereby they are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, in whom also after that they believe, they are sealed with the holy Spirit of promise; secondly, in respect of their conversation: For as he which hath called them is holy, so are they holy in all manner of conversation; adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience brotherly kindnesse, and to brotherly kindnesse charity, that they may neither be barren nor unfruitfull in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient to it, such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby, such as are sanctified by the holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy life, perfecting holinesse in the fear of God, such persons, I say, are really and truly Saints, and being of the Church of Christ, (as all such now must of necessity be) are the proper subject of this part of the Article, *the communion of Saints*, as it is added to the former, *the holy Catholick Church*.

Now as these are the Saints of the Church of Christ, from whence they

1 Cor. I. 2.

1 John 5. 1.

Acts 15. 9.

1 Cor. 6. 11.

Eph. 1. 13.

1 Pet. I. 15.

2 Pet. I. 8.

they were called *the Churches of the Saints*: so there was never any Church of God but there were such persons in it as were Saints; we read in the Psalms of *the congregation and the assembly of the Saints*; and Moses assured the people of Israel, that *all the Saints of God were in his hand*; we read in the Prophets of *the Saints of the most High*, and at our Saviours death *the bodies of such Saints which slept arose*. Where again we may observe that they were Saints while their bodies were in the grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of *Saint of the Lord*. Such as are holy in their lives do not loose their sanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they loose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence growes that necessary distinction of the Saints on earth, and the Saints in heaven; the first belonging to the Militant, the second to the Triumphant Church. Of the first the Prophet David speaketh expressly, *b Thou art my Lord, my goodnesse extendeth not to thee, but to the Saints that are in the earth*: of these do we read in the Acts of the Apostles; to these did S. Paul direct his Epistles. Of the second doth the Apostle make that question, *c Do ye not know that the Saints shall judge the world*? And all those which were spoken of as Saints then in earth, if truly such and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, Saints in heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a *Saint*, that is, a man of holinesse; having also distinguished the Saints before, and under the Gospel, (which difference is onely observable as to this exposition of the Creed,) and again distinguishing the same Saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also shewed that of all these, those Saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the Church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those Saints have this Communion, and in what the Communion which they have consists.

First then, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ, have communion with God the Father; for the Apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them, (*that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us*, saith S. John,) and did at the same time declare that their communion was *with the Father*. Wherefore being all the Saints of God under the Gospel receiving the doctrine of the Apostles have communion with them; being the communion of the Apostles was the communion with the Father, it followeth that all the Saints of God under the Gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the Vine, so the Father is the husbandman; and thus the Saints partake of his care and inspection, As Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God, so all which are heirs of the faith of Abraham are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we onely friends, but also sons; for behold *what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God*. Thus must we acknowledge that the Saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the great and precious promises given unto them, they become partakers of the divine nature.

Secondly,

1 Cor. 14. 33

Psal. 89. 5, 7,
149. 1. קהל
: קדשם LXX.
: שם אלהים א-
להים, רב
: קדשם א-
להים אלהים,
Pulg. Lat. in
Ecclesia & in
consilio san-
ctorum. Deut.

33. 3. Dan. 7.
18, 21, 22, 25.

Matth. 27. 52.
Quis ignorat
sub altera di-
spensatione;

Dei omnes
retro Sanctos
ejusdem fuisse
meriti cujus
nunc Chri-
stiani sunt?

S. Hieron. adv.
Jovinian.

aPsal. 106. 16.

bPsal. 16. 2, 3

c 1 Corin. 6. 2.

1 John 1. 3.

καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν
τὴν Πατρὶς.

Iac. 2. 23

1 John 3. 1

2 Pet. 14. 3
καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν.

Secondly, the Saints of God living in the Church of God have communion with the Son of God: for, as the Apostle said, *our communion is with the Father and the Son*; and this connexion is infallible, because *he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son*; and our Saviour prayed for all such as should believe on him through the word of the Apostles, that they might be one, as the Father is one in him and he in the Father, that they also may be one in both. I in them, saith Christ, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. This communion of the Saints with the Son of God, is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our sins, and the curse due unto them; while we all have received of his fulnesse, grace for grace; and are all called to the fellowship of his sufferings that we may be conformable to his death. What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs, of the Bridegroom and the Spouse: what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the Vine, that is the communion of Saints with Christ. For God hath called us unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Thirdly, the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost; and the Apostle hath two wayes assured us of the truth thereof, one Rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, if there be any fellowship of the Spirit; the other devoutly, praying for it, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all*. The Saints are therefore such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost, for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for hereby do we become the Sons of God, in that we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry *Abba father*; and thereby doe we become coheirs with Christ, in that, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father*; so that we are no more servants, but sons; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ. This is the communion which the Saints enjoy with the three persons of the blessed Trinity: this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when the Lord appeared to him, and three men stood by him; for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, *If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him*. Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting: for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth in the Saints; for know ye not, saith the Apostle, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?

Fourthly, the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the holy Angels. They who did foretell the birth of John the forerunner of Christ, they who did annunciate unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world, they who sung a glorious hymn at the Nativity of the Son of God, they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abrahams bosome, they who appeared unto Christ from heaven in his agonie to strengthen him, they who opened the prison doors and brought the Apostles forth, they who at the

end

end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetuall relation to the children of God. Nay, *are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?* They have a particular sense of our condition, for Christ hath assured us that *there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the Angels, who are all the Angels, that is, the Messengers of God, are yet called the Angels of men, according to the admonition of Christ, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, That in heaven their Angels doe alwayes behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

Heb. i. 14.

Luke 15. 10.

Matth. 18. 10.

Thus far have we considered the Communion of Saints with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God and his holy Angels, while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them.

Fifthly therefore, the Saints of God, while they are of the Church of Christ on earth, have some kind of communion with those men which are truly Saints. There were not hypocrites among the Jews alone, but in the Church of Christ many cry Lord Lord, whom he knoweth not. The tares have the priviledge of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fish of the net, as well as the good. The Saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a Saint and Hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same open profession of faith, both agree in the acknowledgement of the same principles of religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread, and drink the wine, which Christ hath appointed to be received: but the Hypocrite doth not communicate with the Saint in the same saving grace; in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit, for then he were not an hypocrite but a Saint: a Saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking in fidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godliness, for then he were not a Saint but an Hypocrite. Thus the Saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness, and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The Apostles command runneth thus, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness;* and again, *Be not partaker of other mens sins;* and a voice from heaven spake concerning Babylon, *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins.* To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Ephes. 5. 11.

Μη κοινωνήτε

το τοῖς ἔργοις.

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Μη κοινωνήτε τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις.

Revel. 18. 4.

Ὥρα μὴ συνκοινωνήσατε τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις.

Duobus modis non te

Having thus considered those who differ from the Saints of God; first, in respect of their humanity, as they are men; secondly, in re-

maculat malus, si ei non consentias, & si te darguas. Communicatur enim quando facto ejus consortium voluntatis vel approbationis adjungitur. Hoc ergo admonens Apostolus ait, Nolite communicare operibus infructuosis tenebrarum, magis autem & redarguite, S. Aug. de Verbis Dom. Serm. 12.

ference

ference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness: we are now to consider such as differ either onely in person, as the Saints alive, or in present condition also, as the Saints departed.

1 Iohn 1. 7.
κοινωνία μὴ
ἀλλοτρίαν.

Colos. 2. 19.

Sixtly therefore, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ have communion with all the Saints living in the same Church. *If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another*: we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, we are all endued with the graces of the same mutuall love and affection, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same stock, and for receiving life from the same root, all holding the same head, from which all the body by joynts and bands having nourishment ministred and knit together, encreaseth with the encrease of God. For in the philosophy of the Apostle the nerves are not onely the instruments of motion and sensation; but of nutrition also; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head: and being the head of the body is Christ, and all the Saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

† This is that
part of the
Communion of
Saints which
those of the
Ancients espe-
cially insisted
upon, who first
took notice of
it in the Creed.
Sanctorum
Communio-
nem, id est,
cum illis San-
ctis qui in
hac quam su-
scipimus fide
defuncti sunt
societate &
spei commu-
nione teneamur, Serm.
181. de Tem-
pore.
2 Heb. 12. 22,
23.

Lastly, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ, are in communion with all the Saints † departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God. Jerusalem sometimes is taken for the Church on earth, sometimes for that part of the Church which is in heaven, to shew that as both are represented by one, so both are but one City of God. Wherefore thus doth the Apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian faith, *Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of Angels, to the generall assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the Spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediatour of the new covenant.* Indeed, the Communion of the Saints in the Church of Christ with those which are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the Saints alive. For if I have communion with a Saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mysticall union between Christ and his Church, the spirituall conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and encreasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mysticall union, no breach of the spirituall conjunction, and consequently, there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the Saint departed, before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the faith, receiving the Sacraments together; which being in things onely externall, as they were common to them both, and all such externall actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loofeth all communion with the Saint departing, and the Saints surviving cease to have further fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But the true and unfeigned holiness of man wrought by the powerfull influence of the Spirit of God not onely remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internall holiness was the communion

nion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoynd.

This Communion of the Saints in heaven and earth upon the mysticall union of Christ, their head being fundamentall and internall, what acts or externall operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happinesse which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly consider'd, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverentiall respect, and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the Article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition

** We have already produced the words of the 181. Sermon de Tempore, concerning hope. In the same we find also that of imitation, Si igitur cum Sanctis in æterna vita communionem habere volumus, de imitatione eorum cogitemus. Deben enim in nobis aliquid recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignentur Domino supplicare, ib. Hæc sunt vestigia quæ nobis Sancti quoque revertentes in patriam nobis*

unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this Communion, as to the Saints of heaven, then the society* of hope, esteem and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on their side: and what is now taught by the Church of Rome, is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation. The necessity of the belief of this Communion of Saints appeareth, first, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holinesse of life. *a If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another. But if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lye, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousnesse? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?* When Christ sent S. Paul to the Gentiles, it was *e to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ.* Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought *a meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light.* Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

Secondly, the belief of the Communion of Saints is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and cheerfull acknowledgement of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are *c exceeding great and precious promises*, by which we become

reliquerant, ut illorum semitis inhærentes sequeremur ad gaudia, ibid. Beside this imitation, he addeth their desires and care for us below. Cur non properamus & currimus ut patriam nostram videre possimus? Magnus illic charum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum, frequens nos & copiosa turba desiderat jam de sua incolumitate securo, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita, ibid. Of the Venerable esteem we ought to have of them, speaks Eusebius Gallitanus, Credamus & Sanctorum communionem, sed Sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore veneremur. And again, Digne nobis venerandi sunt dum Dei cultum, & futuræ vitæ desiderium contemptu mortis iniquant. Thus far anciently they which expounded this Article: but the late Exposition of the Church of Rome runneth thus, Non solum Ecclesia quæ est in terris communicat bona sua cum omnibus membris sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia Ecclesiæ quæ est in Purgatorio, & Ecclesiæ quæ est in coelis communicat orationes, & merita sua cum Ecclesia quæ est in terris, Bellarmin. in Symbolum. Where the communication of the Suffrages of the Saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communication of the merits of the Saints in heaven to the Saints on earth, are novel expositions of this Article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his Explication of the Creed, much lesse to be found in any of the Ancients Expositors of it. a 1 Iohn 1. 6, 7. b 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15. c Acts 26. 18. d Col. 1. 12. e 2 Pet. 1. 4.

1 Sam. 18. 18. *partakers of the divine nature. What am I?* said David, *and what is my life that I should be son in law to the King?* What are we the sons of men, what are they which are called to be Saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? S. Philip the Apostle said unto our Saviour, *Lord, shew us the Father and it sufficeth;* whereas he hath not onely shewn us, but come unto us with the Father, and dwelt within us by his holy Spirit; he hath called us to the fellowship of the Angels and Archangels, of the Cherubins and Seraphins, to the glorious company of the Apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, to the noble Army of Martyrs, to the holy Church militant in earth, and triumphant in heaven.

Iohn 14. 8.

Thirdly, the belief of *the Communion of Saints* is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those which live, and a reverent respect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoynd to him. Now no conjunction naturall can be compared with that which is spirituall, no temporall relation with that which is eternall. If similitude of shape and feature will create a kindnesse, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoyn affections; what should be the mutuall love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same Spirit? And if all the Saints of God living in communion of the Church deserve the best of our affections here on earth: certainly when they are dissolved and with Christ, when they have been blessed with a sight of God, and rewarded with a Crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us, who are here to wait upon the will of God expecting when such a happy change shall come.

Fourthly, this tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our Brother is the foundation of our duty towards man, and in the language of the Scriptures whosoever is another is our brother; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy and kindnesse unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to doe good unto such as appeare to be lead by the same Spirit: for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of mans compassion; * if they communicate with them in things spirituall, and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things as are temporall and carnall?

* Κοινωνοὶ ἐν
τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ
ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι· οἱ γὰρ
οἱ τοῦ σώματος
καὶ οἱ τοῦ πνεύματος
ἐσμὲν μέλη αὐτοῦ.
Bar-
naba Epist.
part. 2. cap. 1.

To conclude, every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the Article, in which he professeth to believe *the Communion of Saints*; for thereby he is conceived to expresse thus much; I am fully perswaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindnesse of the blessed Angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the externall fellowship which they have in the Word and Sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the Saints on earth as the living members of Christ; nor is this union separated by the death of any, but as Christ in whom they live, is the Lamb

slain

slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the Saints which from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe the Communion of Saints.

ARTICLE X.

The Forgiveness of Sins.

THis Article hath * alwaies bin expressly contained and acknowledged in the Creed, as being a most necessary part of our Christian profession: and for some ages it immediately followed the belief of the † *Holy Church*, and was therefore added immediately after it, to shew that remission of sins was to be obtained in the . Church of Christ. For being the Creed at first was made to be used as a Confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose name baptism was administered; they propounded unto them the *Holy Church*, into which by baptism they were to be admitted, and the *forgiveness of sins*, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some Creeds it was particularly express'd, † *I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.*

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe *forgiveness of sins* is to be obtained in the Church of Christ. For the Explication whereof it will be necessary; first, to declare what is the nature of Remission of sins, in what that action doth consist: secondly, to shew how so great a Privilege is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the

* Therefore Carolus Magnus in his Capitulari. 3. c. 6. inveighs against Basilium the Bishop of Ancyra, because in his Confession of Faith which he delivered in the second Council of Nice (A.D. 787.) he omitted the Remission of sins, which the Apostles in so short a Compendium as the Creed would not omit.

Hanc Apostoli in conlatione fidei, quam ab invicem discessuri quasi quandam credulitatis & prædicationis normam statuerunt, post confessionem Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti posuisse perhibentur; & in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per Prophetam dictum est, Verbum abbreviatum faciet Dominus super terram, hanc ponere minime distulerunt, quia sine hac fidei sinceritatem integram esse minime perspexerunt. Nec cohibuit eos ab ejus professione illius Symboli brevitatis, quam exposcebat sacrae fidei integritas, tantique doni veneranda sublimitas.

† Concordant autem Angeli nobiscum etiam tunc cum remittuntur nostra peccata. Ideo post commemorationem S. Ecclesiae in ordine Confessionis ponitur Remissio peccatorum: per hanc enim stat Ecclesia quæ in terris est, per hanc non perit, quod perierat & inventum est, S. Aug. Enchirid. cap. 64. And to this purpose it is that in his book De agone Christiano, passing from one Article to another with his generall transiition; after that of the Church, he proceedeth with these words, Nec eos audiamus qui negant Ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere, cap. 31. So it followeth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of the Communion of Saints.

∴ Sanctam Ecclesiam teneat . . . in qua & remissio peccatorum & carnis resurrectionis prædicabatur, Rufin. in Symb. Sed neque de ipsis criminibus quamlibet magnis remittendis in S. Ecclesia desperanda est misericordia, S. Aug. Enchir. cap. 65. In remissionem peccatorum. Hæc in Ecclesia si non esset, nulla spes esset. Remissio peccatorum si in Ecclesia non esset, nulla futura vitæ & liberationis æternæ spes esset. Gratias agimus Deo, qui Ecclesiae suæ dedit hoc donum, Author Homil. 119. de Tempore. Quia singuli quique coetus Hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, & suam esse Catholicam Ecclesiam putant; sciendum est illam esse veram, in qua est religio, confessio, & poenitentia, quæ peccata & vulnera, quibus est subiecta imbecillitas carnis, salubriter curat. Lactan. l. 4. c. 30. † These are the words of the Constantinopolitan Creed, Ὁμοῶς ἐν βαπτισμῷ εἰς ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. Before which Epiphanius in his lesser Creed, Ὁμοῶς ἐν βαπτισμῷ εἰς ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, in the Larger, Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς βαπτισμὸν μὴ μετανεύον, in Ancorato. S. Cyril both these together, Εἰς ἃν βαπτισμῷ πάντας εἰς ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. Pelegrinus Laureac. Episc. Credo unum Baptismum in remissionem omnium peccatorum. Symbolum Æthiopicum. Credimus unum Baptisma in remissionem omnium peccatorum in sæcula sæculorum.

Church. That we may understand the notion of *forgivenesse of sins*, three Considerations are required; first, what is the nature of Sin, which is to be forgiven: secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of Sin, which wanteth forgivenesse; thirdly, what is the remission it self, or the loosening of that obligation.

1 John 3. 4.

As the power of Sin is revealed onely in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the Apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of Sin. *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law*, saith S. John, and then rendreth this reason of that universall assertion, *for sin is the transgression of the law*. Which is an Argument drawn from the Definition of Sin; for he saith not, *Every sin is the transgression of the law*, which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition onely, to have proved the Universality of his Assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, *Sin is the transgression of the law*, which is sufficient speaking it by way of † definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the Apostle affirming, that *the law worketh wrath*, that is, a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, *for where no law is there is no transgression*. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is * sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the law is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary unto the prohibition of the Law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by the actions committed against the law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to doe that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whither by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the Law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of Sin.

† The manner of the Apostles speech is also to be observed, having an Article prefixed both to the subject and the predicate; as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be. *† ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.* a Rom. 4. 15.
* Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ & cœlestium inobedientia peccatorum? S. Ambrosii de Paradiso, c. 8. Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem, S. Aug. contra Faustum, lib. 22. cap. 27. Quid verum est nisi & Dominum dare præcepta, & animas liberæ esse voluntatis, & malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem à Dei præceptis? Idem de Fide contra Manich. cap. 10. Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in faciendâ justitiâ esse debere perfectos ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam neque peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubeatur ut non sit, Idem de Eccl. Meritis, & Rem. lib. 2: cap. 16.

The second particular to be considered is the Obligation of Sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person: which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the Sin. It is the nature of Lawes in generall to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although they were no threats or penall denunciations accompanying the Lawes of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission passe away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is pass'd, cannot pro-

forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath neder forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to eternall damnation. Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of Sin and obligation to eternall punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it, and the taking off that liableness, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed in our Saviours expreffion. *He hath forgiveness but is liable to eternal death.*

God who hath the Sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetuall and universall rule of humane actions; which law whosoever doth violate or transgress, and thereby sin, (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law) is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act, remaineth; that is, the person who committed it, continueth still a debtor to the vindictive Justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

The third Consideration now followeth, what is the *Forgiveness of Sin*, or in what *Remission* doth consist. Which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion and nature of this act, or how God doth forgive a sinner, is not easie to determine; nor can it be concluded out of the words themselves which doe expresse it, the niceties of whose † originations will never be able to yield a just interpretation.

† The word used in the Creed is *ἀφίεναι*, and that generally like-

wise in use in the New Testament. But from thence we cannot be assured of the nature of this act of God, because *ἀφίεναι* and *ἀφίεναι* are capable of several interpretations. For sometimes *ἀφίεναι* is *emittere*, and *ἀφίεναι* *emissio*. As Gen. 35. 18. *Ἐξήντη ἡ ἐν τῷ ἀφίεναι αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν*, not cum dimitteret eam anima, as it is translated, but cum emitteret ea animam, i. e. efflaret; as *ἀφίεναι τὸ πνεῦμα*, *emisit Spiritum*, Mat. 25. 50. So Gen. 45. 2. *Καὶ ἀφίεναι φωνὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ*, not dimisit, but *emisit vocem cum fletu*, as *ἀφίεναι φωνὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ*, *emissa voce magna*, Mark 15. 37. In the like manner *ἀφίεναι* *διὰ δακρύων* are *emissiones maris*, 2 Sam. 22. 16. as *ἀφίεναι δάκρυον*, Joel 1. 20. to which sense may be referred that of Hesych, *Ἀφίεναι δακρυόεντα*. And this interpretation of *ἀφίεναι* can have no relation to the remission of sins. Secondly, *ἀφίεναι* is often taken for *mittere*, as Gen. 10. 6. *ὡς ἀφίεναι σὶ ἀφίεναι αὐτῶν*. Matth. 3. 15. *ἀφίεναι ἀφίεναι, ὅτι ἀφίεναι αὐτὸν*, which the Vulgar first translated well *Sine modo*, and then ill, *Tunc dimisit eum*, Matth. 7. 4. *ἀφίεναι ἐκ δακρύων*, *sine ejiciam*; So Hesych, *ἀφίεναι, σὺν δακρύων*. And this hath as little relation to the present subject. Thirdly, *ἀφίεναι* is sometimes *relinquere*, and *deserere*, as Gen. 43. 33. *ἀφίεναι ἵνα ἀφίεναι ἀφίεναι καὶ ἡμῶν*. Mat. 5. 24. *ἀφίεναι ἐκ τῆς οὐχίας σου*. 7. 4. *ἢ ἀφίεναι αὐτὸν ὡς πορεύσῃ*. 19. 27. *ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι πάντας*. 26. 56. *τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφίεναι αὐτὸν ἰερόν*. And in this acception it cannot explicate unto us what is the true notion of *ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας*. Fourthly, it is taken for *omittere*, as Mat. 23. 23. *ἢ ἀφίεναι τὰ βαπτίσματα ἡνὶ ἡμῶν*, and Luc. 11. 42. *ταῦτα ἰδεὶ ποιῶναι, καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀφίεναι*, and yet we have nothing to our present purpose. But fifthly it is often taken for *remittere*, and that particularly in relation to a debt, as Mat. 18. 27. *τὸ δάκρυον ἀφίεναι αὐτῷ* and verse 32. *πάντες τὸν ὀφειλὴν ἔχοντες ἀφίεναι*. Which acception is most remarkable in the year of release, Deut. 15. 1. 2. *Δι' ἡ τὰ ἔτη ποιῶντες ἀφίεναι*. Καὶ ἡ τὸ ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι ἀφίεναι πᾶν χεῖρ ἡμεῖς ὀφειλόμενοι πᾶσι, ἢ τὸν ἀφίεναι σου ἢ ἀφίεναι σου, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι σου. Now this remission or release of debts hath a great affinity with remission of sins; for Christ himself hath conjoynd these two together, and called our sins by the name of debts, and promised remission of sins to us by God, upon our remission of debts to man. And therefore he hath taught us thus to pray, *Ἀφίεναι ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἡμῶν, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι τοῖς ὀφειλόμενοι ἡμῶν*, Matth. 6. 12. Besides he hath not onely made use of the notion of debt, but any injury done unto a man, he calls a sin against man, and exhorteth to forgive those sins committed against us, that God may forgive the sins committed by us, which are injuries done to him, Luke 17. *Ἐὰν ἀφίεναι εἰς τὸ ἀφίεναι σου, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι αὐτοῦ, ἢ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεναι αὐτοῦ*.

the same word hath been often used to signifie the same action of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular notion, but severall times hath * another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins, therefore I conceive the nature of *forgivenessse of sins* is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such wayes and means which were used by God in the working and performing of it, then in this, or any other word which is made use of in expressing it.

Now that we may understand what was done toward remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what is done in it: it is first to be observed, that *almost all things by the law were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission.* And what was then legally done, was but a type of that which was to be performed by Christ; and therefore the blood of Christ must necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he *once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* It must then be acknowledged, and can be denied by none, that Christ did suffer a painfull and a shamefull death, as we have formerly described it; that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin; for *this man*, saith the Apostle, *offered one sacrifice for sins*; that the sins for which he suffered were not his own, *for Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust*; he was *holy, harmlesse, undefiled, and separate from sinners*, and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered, were ours, for *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; He was delivered for our offences, he gave himself for our sins, he dyed for our sins according to the Scriptures*; that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself to free us from the punishment due unto our sins; for God *laid on him the iniquity of us all*, & *made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin*: *he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed*; that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our sins it cometh to passe that our sins are forgiven, for, *This is my blood*, saith our Saviour, *of the New Testament, (or Covenant,) which is shed for many for the remission of sins.* *In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgivenessse of sins according to the riches of his grace.*

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that the *forgivenessse of sins*, which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise doe believe, containeth in it a Reconciliation of an offended God, and a Satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a Reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a Satisfac-

* We must not onely look upon the propriety of the words used in the New Testament, but we must also reflect upon their use in the Old, especially in such subjects as did belong unto the Old Testament as well as the New. Now ἀπολύσις ἀμαρτίας is there used for the verb נָסַח, as Isa.

22. 15. אִם יִכָּכֶר הָעֵדֶן הוּא לְכֹס עַר הַמִּתְחַוֶּה:

Οὐκ ἀπολύσονται οὐτὶν αὐτὸν ἡ ἀμαρτία, ὡς ἀπολύσονται.

Sometimes for the verb נָסַח

as Gen. 50. 17.

שָׂמָה פַּעַם מִדְּבַר וְהִסְתַּחֲרֹת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָיו מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וְהָאֲדָמָה אֲבֹתָיו וְהָאֲדָמָה אֲבֹתָיו.

Psal. 25. 18.

וְשָׂמָה לְכֹס הַמִּתְחַוֶּה

וְהִסְתַּחֲרֹת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָיו

וְהִסְתַּחֲרֹת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָיו

And in that remarkable place, which

S. Paul made

use of to de-

clare the na-

ture of Remis-

sion of sins.

Psal. 32. 1.

אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁכַּח עָוֹן

וְהִסְתַּחֲרֹת אֶת־אֲבוֹתָיו

ἀπολύσις αὐτῶν αὐτοῦ. Sometimes it is taken for נָסַח, as Num. 14. 19. סָלַח נָא לַעֲדָן הָעָם הַזֶּה. Now being ἀπολύσις in relation to sins, is used for נָסַח, signifying expiation, and reconciliation; for נָסַח, signifying elevation, portation or ablation; for נָסַח, signifying pardon and indulgence; we cannot argue from the word alone, that God in forgiving sins doth onely and barely release the debt. There is therefore no force to be layd upon the words ἀπολύσις ἀμαρτίας. Remissio peccatorum, or, as the Ancient Fathers, Remissa peccatorum. So Tertullian, Diximus de remissa peccatorum, adv. Marcion. lib. 4. cap. 18. S. Cyprian. Epist. 14. Qui blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum non habet remissionem, sed reus est æterni peccati. Idem de Bono Patien. Dominus baptizatur a servo, & remissionem peccatorum daturus, ipse non dedignatur lavacro regenerationis corpus abluere. Idem lib. 3. Epist. 8. of an infant, Qui ad remissionem peccatorum recipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata. Adde the Interpreter of Irenæus concerning Christ, Remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum.

a Heb. 9. 22. ὡς αὐτὸν ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς. b Heb. 9. 26. it is not onely ἀπολύσις, but ἀπολύσις ἀμαρτίας. c Heb. 10. 12. διὰ τῆς 3. 18. e Heb. 7. 26. f Isa. 53. 5. Rom. 4. 25. Gal. 1. 4. 1 Cor. 15. 3. g Isa. 53. 6. h 2 Cor. 5. 21. i Isa. 53. 5. k Math. 26. 28. l Ephes. 1. 7.

ction,

tion, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, We may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because Christ by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured; because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christs death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain Christs death to be a propitiation for us. For we are *justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. We have an Advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins.* For God loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. It is evident therefore that Christ did render God propitious unto us by his blood, (that is, his sufferings unto death) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer, and though it be most true, that he *so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*; yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

2 Cor. 5. 18.

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 20.

1 Sam. 29. 4.

Εν τίνι διαλλαγήσεται ὁ κύριος τὸν ἀντὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀντιπαρῶν ἐκείνου, ἡ δὲ ἀντιπαρῶν, acceptum se reddet, ita se geret ut Saul eum in gratiam recipere velit.

Mat. 5. 23, 24.

πρῶτον διαλλάγητι τὸ εὖ ἀδελφῷ σου.

1 Cor. 7. 11.

Rom. 5. 10.

This Reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; For all are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ; and that by virtue of his death; for *when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself.* In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but no where teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the Scripture to reconcile a man to God, is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the Princes of the Philistines spake of David, *Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his Master? should it not be with the heads of these men?* wherewith shall he reconcile Saul who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable but by betraying these men unto him; As our Saviour adviseth, *If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and goe thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother,* that is, reconcile thy brother to thy self, whom thou hast injured, render him by thy submission favourable unto thee, vho hath something against thee, and is offended vwith thee. As the Apostle adviseth the wive that departeth from her husband, *to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband,* that is, to appease and get the favour of her husband. In the like manner vve are said to be reconciled unto God, vwhen God is reconciled, appeased and become gracious and favourable unto us, and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God, vwhen he hath moved, and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, vwhen he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour. Thus *when we were enemies we were reconciled to God,* that is, notwithstanding he was offended vwith us for our

our sins, we were restored unto his favour, *by the death of his Son.*

Whence appeareth the weaknesse of the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures † we are said to be reconciled unto God, but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expression, it is understood, that he which is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures, is restored unto the favour of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled. As when David was to be reconciled unto Saul, it was not that David should lay down his enmity against Saul, but that Saul should become propitious and favourable unto David: and therefore where the language is that David should be reconciled unto Saul, the sense is, that Saul who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased and so reconciled unto David.

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners by the death of Christ, who *while we were yet sinners dyed for us*, because the punishment which Christ, who was our Surety, endured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God. *The Son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister,* ^a *and to give his life a ranfome for many.* Now a ranfome is a price given to redeem such as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound cometh free. Now all sinners were obliged to undergoe such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ranfome for them, and that a proper ranfome, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ranfome is properly nothing else but something of * price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is intralld. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price, neither is it more certain that he dyed, then that he bought us; ^b *Ye are bought with a price*, saith the Apostle, and it is the ^c *Lord who bought us*, and the price which he paid was his blood, for ^d *we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* Now as it was the blood of Christ; so was it a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was

† Adhuc vero quod nos Deo reconciliari quid affert? Primum, nusquam Scripturam asserere, Deum nobis a Christo reconciliatum, verum id tantum quod nos per Christum aut mortem ejus sumus reconciliati, vel Deo reconciliati, ut ex omnibus locis quæ de reconciliatione agunt videre est. Cat. Rac. cap. 8. To this may be added the Observation of Socinus. Ita communem ferre loquendi consuetudinem, ut scilicet est reconciliatus fuisse dicatur, per quem stabat ne amicitia aut denuo existeret, aut conservaretur: de Christo

Servatore, p. 1. c. 8. Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of Saul and David, and in the person mentioned in the Gospel, who is commanded to be reconciled to him whom he had offended, and who had something against him. ^a Matth. 20. 28. δὲνα πλὴν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λύτρον ἀπὸ πολλῶν. What is the true notion of λύτρον, will easily appear, because both the origination and use of the word is sufficiently known. The origination is from λύνεω solveo, to loose, λύτρον quasi λύτροειον. Etym. ὀπίσσω τὰ ἀπὸ λύτρου, ὡς λύτρον τὰ λύτρου. Eustath. Διὰ τὸ ὀπίσσω (ital. leg.) τὰ λύτρου ἐκ τῆς ἀπὸ λύτρου καὶ συνηθείας, ὡς λύτρον λύτρου, συνηθείας, ἢ λυτ. δ. Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis solvatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ἰσχυρισμὸς οὐκ ἐστὶν τὸ λύτρον. δὲνα καὶ λύτρου τὰ δίδωμι λύτρον τὰ εἰς πῶτο δίδωμι, Eustathius upon that of Homer Iliad. α'. Λυσόμενος τὸ θυγάτην. It is properly spoken of such things as are given to redeem a captive, or recover a man into a free condition. Hesych. πάντα τὰ διδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκλησιν ἀνθρώπων. (So I read it, not ἀνάκλησιν.) So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is λύτρον, and whatsoever is not given for such an end deserveth not that name in Greek. As the city Antandrus was so called because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive. "Ὅτι Ἀσκανίου αἰχμαλωτῆς ἰσχυρισμὸς Πηλεΐδῃ καὶ αὐτῷ αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν δίδωμι λύτρου, καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. Etym. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language then the words of our Saviour, δὲνα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν λύτρον ἀπὸ πολλῶν δὲνα λύτρου, for λύτρον is τὸ δίδωμι, and ἀπὸ πολλῶν, for it is given ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων, as that city was called "Ανταδρῆς, ὅταν ἀπὸ ἀνδρός δεδωμένη. And therefore 1 Tim. 2. 6. it is said, ὁ ὁδὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιλύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. * Hesych. Λύτρον, τίμημα. b 1 Cor. 6. 20. 7. 23. c 2 Pet. 2. 1. d 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19 This is sufficiently expressed by two words, each of them fully significative of a price: the first simple, which is ἀγοράζω, the second in composition, which is ἱεραγοράζω. That the word ἀγοράζω in the New Testament, significeth properly to buy, appeareth generally in the Evangelists, and particularly, in that place of the Revel. 13. 17. ἵνα μὴ τις ἐπιζητήσῃ ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι. In the same signification it is attributed undoubtedly un-

E e e

precious,

to Christ in respect of us whom he is often said to have bought, as 2 Pet. 2. 1. τὴν ἀγοράσαντα ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποτίμηται, and this buying is expressed to be by a price. 1 Cor. 6. 20. ἐκ ἵστε ἐαυτῶν, ὑπογράψαντες τὰς ψυχὰς. Vulg. Non estis vestri, empti enim estis pretio magno, & 1 Cor. 6. 23. Τιμὴν ὑπογράψαντες, καὶ οὐκ ἀποτίμηται. What this price was is also evident, for the price was the τιμὴ αἵμα, the precious blood of Christ, or the blood given by way of price, Rev. 5. 9. ὅτι ἰσθῆναι καὶ ὑπογράψαντες τὸ δὲ θεοῦ ἵμνες ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου. Which will appear more fully by the compound word ἱεραγορά. Gal. 3. 13. Χρεῖς ἡμεῖς ἱεραγοράσμεν ἐν τῇ κατάρτας τῷ νόμῳ, ἡ δὲ ἀγορά καὶ ἡ ἀγορά. and Gal. 4. 4, 5. ἡ δὲ ἀγορά καὶ ἡ ἀγορά, ἡ δὲ ἀγορά καὶ ἡ ἀγορά. Now this ἱεραγορά is proper redemption, or λύτρωσις, upon a proper price, though not silver or gold, yet as proper as silver and gold, and far beyond them both, ἡ δὲ ἀγορά καὶ ἡ ἀγορά, ἡ δὲ ἀγορά καὶ ἡ ἀγορά. τὸ δὲ θεοῦ ἵμνες ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποτίμηται. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποτίμηται. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποτίμηται. 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented, and encreaseth, according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price and dignity of that which is given by way of compensation, is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite Majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ransom for sinners; for God hath purchased his Church with his own blood. Although therefore God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to † remit the price without which we had never been redeemed: neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

† As λύτρεν is a certain price given or promised for liberty so ἀγοράν λύτρεν is to remit the price set upon the head of any man or promised for him.

As we read in the Testament of Lycon the Philosopher.

Δημιτρίῳ μὲν ἡλυθὲν πάλαι ὅντι ἀσίνῃ τῷ λύτρεν. Demetrius had been his servant, and he had set him free upon a certain price which he had engaged himself to pay for that liberty, the summe which Demetrius was thus bound to pay. Lycon at his death remits, as also to Crizon. Κεῖται δὲ Καρποδινίῳ, καὶ τῷ τῷ λύτρεν. Diog. Laeri.

If then we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made, and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what Remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath Sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whensoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offences, and God who is the Law-giver and Sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God for and instead of the eternall death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God then that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man; which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured, taketh off our obligation to eternall punishment.

Thus man who violated by sinning the law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergoe the punishment due unto the sin, and to be inflicted by the wrath of God, is, by the price of the most precious blood of Christ, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favour of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithfull and just to take off all obligation unto punishment from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth the forgiveness of sins. Which is sufficient for the first part of the explication of this Article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of Remission of Sins, in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the Explication, taking notice not onely of the substance, but also of the Order of the Article, observing the Imme-

Immediate connexion of it with the *Holy Church*, and the relation, which in the opinion of the Ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great Priviledge of *forgivenesse of sins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the Church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the Apostles to gather a Church unto him, he foretold that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem*; and when the Church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, *Repent and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out*, and, *Be it known unto you that through this man is preached unto you forgivenesse of Sins*. From whence it appeareth that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the Church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins propounded and preached to all men, was proper and peculiar to the Gospel, which teacheth us that by Christ all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. Therefore John the Baptist, who went before the face of the Lord to prepare his wayes, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their Sins. Luke 24. 47.
Acts 3. 29;
13. 38.
Acts 13. 39.

This, as it was preached by the Apostles at the first gathering of the Church of Christ, I call proper and peculiar to the Gospel, because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the Law. For if we consider the Law it self strictly and under the bare notion of a Law, it promised life onely upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was onely this, *Do this and live*. Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversibile, nor was there any other way or means left in the law of Moses by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other lesse and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them, and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the law, was of some speciall divine indulgence, more then was promised by Moses, though not more then was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the Gospel was mingled with the Law.

Now as to the atonement made by the Sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the Messias, and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so all atonements which were ever made, were onely effectually by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven but by vertue of that satisfaction, though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation, yet the generall doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed, and publickly preached to all nations till the coming of the Saviour of the world, whose name was therefore called Jesus, because he was to save his people from their sins.

Being therefore we are assured that the preaching Remission of sins belongeth not onely certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the Church of Christ, it will be next considerable how this Remission is conferred upon any person in the Church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable,

vable, one relating to the Initiation, the other concerning the Continuation of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most General and irrefragable Assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the Baptisme of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptisme, are remissible, and the person committing those Sins, shall receive forgiveness upon true Repentance at any time, according to the Gospel.

First, it is certain that Forgiveness of Sins was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of Baptism, did also receive the benefit of that Ordinance, which is remission of Sins. John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And S. Peter made this the exhortation of his first Sermon, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. In vain doth doubting and fluctuating * Socinus endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture; attributing the Remission either to Repentance without consideration of Baptisme, or else to the publick Profession of faith made in Baptisme; or if any thing must be attributed to Baptisme it self, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these Shifts agree with that which Ananias said unto Saul, without any mention either of Repentance or Confession, a *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, and that which S. Paul, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the Church, that Christ doth *sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water*? It is therefore sufficiently certain that Baptisme as it was instituted by Christ after the preadministration of S. John, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this Sacrament.

As those which are received into the Church by the Sacrament of Baptism receive the Remission of their sins of which they were guilty before they were baptized: so † after they are thus made members of the Church, they receive remission of their future sins by their repentance. Christ who hath left us a pattern of prayer, hath thereby taught us for ever to implore and beg the forgiveness of our sins: that as we through the frailty of our nature are alwayes subject un-

Mark I. 1.

Acts 2. 38.

* Vel Baptismo illi hoc est, ablutioni peccatorum Remissionem, nequaquam tribuit Petrus, sed poenitentia; vel si Baptismi quoque rationem ea in re habuit, aut quatenus publicam nominis Jesu Christi professionem continet eam tantum consideravit; aut si ipsius etiam externae ablutionis omnino rationem habere voluit, quod ad ipsam attinet remissionis peccatorum nomine non ipsam remissionem

verè, sed remissionis declarationem, & oblationem quandam intellexit, Soc. de Baptismo, a. 22. 16. b. Eph. 5. 26. † S. Chrysostome speaking of the power of the Priests, & γὰρ οὕτως ἡμεῖς ἀναζητοῦμεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἡμεῖς ἐξουσίαν ἁμαρτημάτων. De Sacerd. 3. Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attractum est regeneratione detrahatur, & tamen activa quoque peccata quaecunque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit tollit) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reatus & ingeneratus & additus, ipsa etiam vita cetera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpolleat fecunditate iustitiæ, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur; quoniam filii Dei quamdiu mortaliter vivunt cum morte configunt; & quamvis de illis sit veraciter dictum, Quotquot Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei: sic tamen Spiritu Dei excitantur, & tanquam filii Dei proficiunt ad Deum, ut etiam spiritu suo (maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore) tanquam filii hominum quibusdam motibus humanis deficiant ad seipso & peccant, S. Augustin. Enchirid. cap. 44. Οὕτως καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐκκαθαίρεται ἁμαρτήματα μετὰ πόνης πολλῆς καὶ ημεῖς τε. Πάντα τοίνυν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁμαρτῶν σπυδῶν, ὡς αὐτὰ ἐξ ἀλείφει ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ αἰχμῶν καὶ τῆς καλῆς αἰσῆς ἀπαιτῶνται τῆς ἐκείνης, καὶ γὰρ μὲν εἰς ἁμάρτημα τῆς, αὐτὴ ἐξ ἁμάρτης, ὡς ἡμεῖς αὐτὰ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἀποδιδοῦναι ἡμῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰ ὀφείλου. S. Chrys. Homil. in Pentecosten. 1.

to sin, so we should alwayes exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favour of God. This then is the comfort of the Gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life incompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagemes of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are alwayes subject to offend, (from whence, whosoever saith *that he hath no sin is a lyer*, contracting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency,) and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply our selves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his grace, and pardoned by his mercy.

And therefore the Church of God, in which Remission of sins is preach'd, doth not onely promise it at first by the Laver of Regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of Repentance; and to deny the Church this power of Absolution is the *Herefy of Novatian*.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this perswasion. For we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God, nay, God himself hath concluded all under sin; we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternall punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearfull expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the Devils, *delivered into chains, and reserved unto judgement*. For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference, remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the *forgivenesse of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem Gods goodnesse and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left to him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity dye, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to shew a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and almighty God. Glorious therefore must the goodnesse of our God appear, who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looseth the obligation, who not imputeth the sin. This is Gods goodnesse; this is mans happiness. For *blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity*. The year of release, the year of Jubilee, was a time of publick joy; and there is no voice like that, *thy sins are forgiven thee*. By this a man is rescued from infernall pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternall happiness.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the *forgivenesse of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be enflamed with the love of God. For that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the

**I call this the Herefy of Novatian, rather then of Novatus, because though they both joyned in it, yet it rather sprung from Novatianus the Roman Presbyter, then from Novatus the African Bishop. And he is thus expressed by Epiphanius, λέγων ἐν τῷ Κοινοῦ, ἀναγινώσκοντες ὡς καὶ καὶ ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διδάσκει, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ὁ Θεός. That is, he acknowledged but one Repentance which was available in Baptisme; after which if any man sinned, there was no mercy remaining for him. To which Epiphanius gives this reply.*

Ἡ ἐξὸς τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ καὶ τοῦ κοινῶς λεγόμενου ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ ἐκκλησίας, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ὁ Θεός. διδόναι γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις, καὶ

μετὰ τὴν μετανοίαν τὴν μετάνοιαν, and again. Διότι οὐδὲ ἄλλος λόγος καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια. Οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ὁ Θεός. Ταῦτα πάντα σαφὲς περὶ τούτου μετὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκκλησίαν. ἔτι δὲ ὅταν ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ πάντες, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ἀνάστασις. ἔτι ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀλλοθεν ἐν ἀλήθειᾳ. ἡ ἀλήθεια. Har. 59. a 2 Pet. 2. 4. b Psal. 31. 1, 2.

Parable

Luke 6. 41, 42. Parable in the Gospel, *There was a certain creditour which had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.* Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Acts 13. 38. Fourthly, the true notion of *forgivenesse of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgivenesse. *Through this man is preached unto us forgivenesse of sins,* and without a surety we had no release. He rendred God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. *We are not our own who are bought with a price: we must glorifie God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are God's.* We must be no longer the servants of men; we are the servants of Christ who are bought with a price.

1 Cor. 6. 16, 20 Fifthly, it is necessary to believe *remission of sins* as wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the Covenant was ratified and confirmed; which mindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a Covenant to expect performances on both parts: and therefore if we look for forgivenesse promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were alwayes preached together, and those which God hath joyned ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear *Acts 5. 31.* *a Prince and a Saviour, and it was to give repentance to Israel and forgivenesse of sins;* He joyned these two in the Apostles commission, saying, *Luke 24. 47.* *that Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.*

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confesse in this Article of *forgivenesse of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I do freely and fully acknowledge, and with unspeakable comfort embrace this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternall punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternall death, it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a rancome, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God, by which propitiation God who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternall punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the Church of Christ the Sacrament of Baptisme for the first remission, and Repentance for the constant forgivenesse of all following trespasses; and thus I believe the *forgivenesse of sins*.

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

THIS Article was anciently deliver'd and acknowledged † by all Churches, onely with this difference, that whereas in other places it was express'd in generall terms, *the Resurrection of the flesh*, they of the Church of Aquileia by the addition of a pronoun pro-pounded it to every single believer in a more particular way of expression, *the Resurrection of this flesh*. And though we have translated it in our English Creed, *the Resurrection of the body*; yet neither the Greek nor Latine ever delivered this Article in those terms, but in these, *the Resurrection of the flesh*; because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestiall and spirituall bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Onely it will be necessary, for shewing our agreement with the Ancient Creeds, to declare that as by *flesh* they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh, so we, when we translate it *body*, understand no other *body* but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the Soul. And this we may very well and properly doe, because our Church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare our selves. For though in the Creed it self, used at Morning & Evening Prayer, the Article be thus delivered, [*the Resurrection of the body*] yet in the Form of Publick Baptisme, where it is propounded by way of question to the God-fathers, in the name of the child to be baptised, it runneth thus [*Doeſt thou believe.... the Resurrection of the flesh?*] We see by daily experience, that all men are mortall, that the body left by the soul, the salt and life thereof, putrifieth and consumeth, and according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust; but these bodies, as frail and mortall as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this Article, in which we professe to believe *the Resurrection of the body*.

When we treated concerning the Resurrection of Christ, we † delivered the proper notion and nature of the Resurrection in Generall, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the Resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular, but referring the Reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us onely to consider what is the Resurrection to come, who they are which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this Resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different

nis resurrectionem. And this was to be observed because, being we read of spirituall bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this S. Ierome gives an account, and withall of the words of the Creed. Exempli causa pauca subijciam, *Credimus*, inquit, *resurrectionem futuram corporum*. Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt coelestia, & terrestria, & aer iste & aura tenuis juxta naturam suam, corpora nominantur, corpus ponunt, non carnem, ut Orthodoxus corpus audiens carnem putet, Hæreticus spiritum recognoscat. Hec enim eorum est prima decipula; quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instruunt alios dolos, & innocentiam simulant, & malitiosos nos vocant, & quasi simpliciter credentes aiunt, *Credimus resurrectionem carnis*. Hoc vero cum dixerint, vulgus indoctum putat sibi sufficere, maxime quia id ipsum & in Symb. creditur, Ep. 55. ad Pam. & Octā. † Pag. 282.

† Cum omnes Ecclesiæ ita sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerant peccatorum remissionem, addant carnis resurrectionem; sancta Aquileiensis Ecclesia, ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; & pro eo quod ceteri dicunt, carnis resurrectionem, nos dicimus, hujus carnis resurrectionem, Ruffin. Apol. advers. Hieron. Satis cauta & provida adjunctione fidem Symboli Ecclesiæ nostræ docet, quæ in eo quod à ceteris traditur, carnis resurrectionem, uno addito pronomine tradit, hujus carnis resurrectionem, Id. in Symb.

* The Greeks always, *σάρκα* αἰσθητήν, the Latines, Car-

from

Job 17.14, 16.

Ezek. 37.1, 7, 8, 10.

from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of Christ's Resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption; all the parts thereof continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them, they were onely deposited in the Sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortall bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality; we may say to corruption, *Thou art my Father, to the worm, thou art my Mother and my Sister; our corps go down to the bars of the pit, and rest together in the dust.* Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of soul and body as Christ's was, but our whole Tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled and confounded with the dust of the earth. There is a description of a kind of Resurrection in the Prophet Ezekiel, in which there is supposed a valley full of bones, and there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they liv'd and stood upon their feet. But in the Resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts,

We must therefore endeavour to shew that the bodies of men howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be recollected in themselves, and united to their own souls. And for the more facil and familiar proceeding in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method; First to prove, that such a Resurrection is not in it self impossible. Secondly, to shew that it is upon generall considerations highly probable. Thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in it self impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon naturall and morall grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon Evangelicall principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

* Pliny reckoning up those things which he thought not to be in the power of God, mentions these two, mortales eternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos, l. 2. c. 7. And Aeschylus, though a Pythagorean, yet absolutely denies it to be in the power of God, for so he makes Apollo speak to the Eumenides,

First, I confesse * Philosophers of old did look upon the Resurrection of the body as impossible, and though some of them thought the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoynd to the spirit of a man. We read of a certain Philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks, who encountered S. Paul, and when they heard of the resurrection they mocked him, some saying, that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange Gods, because he preached unto them Iesus and the Resurrection. But as the Ancient Philosophers thought a Creation impossible, because they looked onely upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a

Πῶς αὖτε δύναται, ἵνα τὸ δ' αὖτε,
καὶ κείνα πάντα μνησθὲν λυθῇ;
Ἄνδρες δ' ἐπειδὴ αἶμα' ἀναστήσονται
Ἄπαι θανάτου, ὅστις ἴσ' ἀνάστασις.
Τῶντο ἰσχυρὸν ἐν ἰσχύϊ πάντες
Οἶμός, τὰ δ' αἶμα πάντα' αἶμα τὰ δ' αἶμα
Στῆσαν τι θνητοί, εἰδὲν ἀδμύχαν αἶμα.

Aeschyl. Eumenid.

Uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur: Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur, Terrell. a Acts 17.18:

Crea-

eth what are the proper parts to be conjoyned, what is the proper *gluten* by which they may become united. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

And as the Wisdome is infinite, so the Power of this Agent is illimited; for God is as much Omnipotent as Omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance. All creatures must not only suffer, but doe what he will have them; they are not only passively, but actively obedientiall. There is no atome of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applyed and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the Agent, or him who is to raise us.

Secondly, the Resurrection is not impossible in relation to the Patient, because where we look upon the power of God nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is so far from a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rationall and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we loose in death is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they loose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are* laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the Chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, then that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they doe. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are† within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made, was as far from being flesh, as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an Omnipotent power which could mould that into an humane body, and breath into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, humane bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easie . . . to make that to be again which once hath been, as to

* Non sola anima seponitur, habet & caro suos sinus interim, in aquis, in ignibus, in alitibus, in bestiis; cum in hac dissolvi videtur, velut in vasa transfunditur, *Terzull. de Resurrectione carnis, c. 68.* Tu pe-
rere Deo cre-
dis si quid oculis nostris

hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne sive arescit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo elementorum custodi reservatur, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Omnia quæ discerpuntur, & in favillas quasdam putrescunt, integra Deo sunt, in illa enim elementa mundi eunt unde primo venerunt, *S. August. in Psalmi. Enarrat. 62.*

† Absit autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit Omnipotentia Creatoris omnia revocare quæ vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit; vel in pulverem cineremque collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhalatum. Absit ut sinus ullus, secretumque naturæ ita recipiat aliquid subtractum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut lateat cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem, *S. August. de Civitate Dei, lib. 22, cap. 20.*

. . . Recogita quid fueris antequam esses, utique nihil. Meminisses enim si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras priusquam esses, idem nihil factus cum esse desieris, cur non possis esse rursus de nihilo, ejusdem Authoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? Qui non eras, factus es, cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde,

make

si potes, rationem qua factus es, & tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es quod nunquam fuisti aliquando, *Tertull. Apolog. c. 48.* Utique idoneus est reficere qui fecit. Quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedit quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione, *Idem de Resur. carnis, c. 11.* Difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Utique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuit. Quomodo ergo impossibile esse dicis, ut Deus qui hominem formavit ex nihilo reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulverem, qui etiam si in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus, sicut effecit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuissemus? *S. Augst. de Verbis Apost. Serm. 19. To the same purpose the Jews, דלא חוררו דהו לא כל שכן*

make that to be which before was not. When there was no man, God made him of the earth, and therefore when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible, which is our first Conclusion.

Secondly, the Resurrection is not onely in it self possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many generall considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immateriall, so are they immortal, and being once created by the Father of spirits they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the fowls of the air, severall of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, divers of the plants of the earth are of a more durable constitution, and out-live the sons of men. And can we think that such materiall and mortall, that such understanding souls should by God and nature be furnished with bodies of so long permanſion, and that our spirits should be joyned unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddeny dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence; but when the soul of man which is immortal is forced from it's body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the onely life belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

Again, if we look upon our selves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordinable unto reward or punishment. The Angels who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being onely spirits they were subject to no other dissolution then annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all the Angels are incapable of a Resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedome cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded; and therefore when they dye, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us, are neither capable of reward or punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they dye, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason

for their Resurrection. But man by the nobleneſſe of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being ſubject to death, and yet after that, being capable in another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a puniſhment for what he hath done ill in the fleſh, it is neceſſary that he ſhould riſe from the dead to enjoy the one, or ſuffer the other. For there is not only no juſt Retribution rendred in this life to man, but, conſidering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is poſſible, and often cometh to paſſe, that one man may commit ſuch ſins as all the puniſhments of this life can no way equalize them. What is then more proper, conſidering the providence of a moſt juſt God, then to believe that man ſhall ſuffer in another life ſuch torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reaſon think that the ſoul alone ſhall undergoe thoſe ſufferings, becauſe the lawes which were given to us are not made in reſpect of that alone, but have moſt frequent reflexion on the body, † without which in this life the ſoul can neither do nor ſuffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable from the generall conſideration of humane actions and divine retributions, that there ſhall be a *Reſurrection of the fleſh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

Furthermore, beſide the principles of which we conſiſt, and the actions which flow from us, the conſideration of the things without us, and the naturall courſe of variations in the creature, will render the Reſurrection yet more highly probable. Every ſpace of 24. hours teacheth thus much, in which there is alwayes a revolution amounting to a Reſurrection. The * day dies into a night, and is buried in ſilence and in darkneſſe; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkneſſe, riſing from the dead of night; this is a diurnall Reſurrection.

As the day dies into night, ſo doth the Summer into Winter: the ſap is ſaid to deſcend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the earth is covered with ſnow, or cruſted with froſt, and becomes a generall ſepulchre; when the Spring appeareth all begin to riſe, the plants and flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow and flouriſh; this is the annuall Reſurrection. The Corn by which we live, and for want of which we periſh with famine, is notwithstanding caſt upon the earth, and buried in the ground, with a deſign that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this conſtant experiment, and we continue this preſent life by ſucceſſion of Reſurrections. Thus all things are repaired by corrupting, are preſerved by periſhing,

† Quod congruet judicari hoc competet etiam reſuscitari. *Tertullian. de Reſurrectione carnis. cap. 14.* Negent operarum ſocietatem ut merito poſſint mercedem negare. Non ſit particeps in ſententia caro, ſi non fuerit & in cauſa. Sola anima revocetur, ſi ſola decedit. At enim non magis ſola decedit, quam ſola decucurrit illud unde decedit, vitam hanc dico, *Ibid. cap. 15.* Cum omnis vitæ noſtræ

uſus in corporis animæque conſortio ſit, reſurrectio autem aut boni actus præmiũ habeat aut poenam improbi, neceſſe eſt corpus reſurgere cujus actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in judicium vocabitur ſine corpore, cum de ſuo & corporis contubernio ratio præſtanda ſit? *S. Ambroſ. de Fide Reſur. a 2 Cor. 5. 10.* * Κατανόουν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα τῶν τῶν, πῶς καὶ αὐτὰ τῶν καὶ ἀνίσταται, *S. Theoph. Antioch. ad Autol. l. 1.* Dies moritur in noctem, & tenebris uſquequaque ſepelitur. Funestatur mundi honor, omnis ſubſtantia denigratur. Sordent, ſilent, ſtupent cuncta; ubique juſtitium eſt, quies rerum: ita lux amiſſa lugetur. Et tamen ruſus cum ſuo cultu, cum dote, cum ſole, eadem & integra & tota univerſo orbi revivſcit, interficiens mortem ſuam noctem, reſcindens ſepulchram ſuam tenebras, hæres ſibi metipſam exiſtens, donec & nox revivſcat, cum ſuo & illa ſuggeſtu. Redaccenduntur enim & ſtellarum radii, quos matutina ſuccenſio extinxerat. Reducuntur & ſiderum abſentia, quas temporalis diſtinctio exemerat. Redornantur & ſpecula Lunæ quæ menſtruus numerus adtriverat, *Tertullian. de Reſurrectione carnis, cap. 12.* Lux quotidie interfecta reſplendet, & tenebræ pari vice decedendo ſuccedunt, ſidera deſuncta viveſcunt, tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt, fructus conſummantur & redeunt, *Idem Apol. cap. 48.* Διὸς ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐρανὸς τῶν τῶν καὶ ἀνίσταται, ἀνατίνει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμέρα: διὸ πάλιν καὶ ἀνατίνει τὸ σπέρμα, *Epiphani. in Ancorato.*

and

and revive by dying; and can we † think that man, the Lord of all these things, which thus dye and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again? Is it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of humane nature, of the liberty and remunerability of humane actions, and of the naturall revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the Resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

We must not rest in this School of Nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelihoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility, unto a high presumption and probability, so must we passe from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the Revelation of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the Resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance, I shall shew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not onely delivered that intention in his Word, but hath also severall wayes confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a Revelation of this truth. The Jews insist upon such weak inferences out of the Law, as shew that the Resurrection was not clearly delivered by Moses; and in the book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed, they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of Job are very expresse, *“ I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. ”* Against the evidence of this truth there are two Interpretations; one very new of some late Opinionists, who understand this of a suddain restitution to his former temporall condition; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happinesse of another life, without any reference to a resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any suddain restitution,

reddat intercipit, ut custodiat perdit, ut integret vitiat, ut etiam ampliet prius decoquit. Siquidem uberiora & cultiora restituit quam exterminavit: revera sœnore interitu, & injuria usura, & lucro damno: semel dixerim, universa conditio recidiva est. Quodcunque conveneris fuit, quodcunque amiseris nihil non iterum est: omnia in statum redeunt cum abscesserint; omnia incipiunt cum delierint: ideo finiuntur ut fiant, nihil deperit nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolubilis rerum testatio est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam præscripsit Deus antequam literis; viribus prædicavit antequam vocibus. Præmisit tibi Naturam magistram, submisit & Prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ discipulus naturæ; quo statim admittas cum audieris, quod ubique jam videris, nec dubites Deum carnis etiam resuscitorem, quem omnium noris restitutorem. Et utique omnia homini resurgunt cui procurata sunt: potro non homini nisi & carni, quale est ut ipsa depercat in totum propter quam & cui nihil deperit? Idem de Resur. carnis, cap. 12. * They produce severall places out of Moses, which when the Resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it, but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a Mystery. As because in the formation of man Moses useth the word *אֶחָד* with two jods, and in the formation of beasts *אֶחָד* with but one; therefore the beasts are made but once, but man twice; once in his Generation, and again in his Resurrection. They strangely apprehend a promise of the Resurrection, even in the Malediction. Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return; *אֶחָד לֹא נָאָחַר אֶחָד*, it is not thou shalt goe to the dust, but thou shalt return. As if he had said, thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again, as now thou doest. So from those words Exod. 15. 1. *אֶחָד וְאֶחָד נָאָחַר*, they conclude the resurrection, upon this ground, *אֶחָד לֹא נָאָחַר אֶחָד*, it is not said, he sang, but, he shall sing, viz. after the resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like Arguments did the Rabins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadducees; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job. a Job 19. 25, 26.

† Omnia pereundo servantur, omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium & resurgentium, ad hoc morieris ut pereas? Tertull. Apolog. c. 48. Revolvuntur hyemes & æstates, & verna aut autumnus cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus.

Quippe etiam terræ de cœlo disciplina est arbores vestire post spolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ absumpta sunt semina, nec prius exhibere quæ absumpta: Mira ratio de fraudatrice servatrix, ut

Job 19. 25, 26

אני ידעתי

נאלי

אחריני

Dan. 12. 2.
The Jews collected from hence the Resurrection, as Rabina in Sanhedrin, & in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 93. 3.
אני ידעתי
עפר הם המתים
שנ וריבים משנו
אמת עפר יקצו
וירי Rabbi Rachmon
said, that the sleepers in the dust are the dead, as it is written, Dan.

12. 2. Many

of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, &c. And this is onely denied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it onely and wholly to the times of Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by S. Hierome, Tunc hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, & operi erant malorum pondere, & quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere resurrexerunt, & de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes legis resurgentes in vitam æternam, & prævaricatores in oprobrium sempiternum: where it is to be observed that he gives a probable glosse of the former part of the verse, but none at all of the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former: for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternall life, nor to an everlasting contempt. Thus, I say, onely the Gentiles did interpret it, but now the Socinians are joyned to them. So Volkelius urges, quod in præcedentibus de Antiochi tempore agatur, & resurrectio illa ad tempora quæ jam præcesserunt spectet.

which

or any alteration of his temporall condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, *O that my words were now written, O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!* He desires that his words may continue as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a finner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he pleadeth a Redeemer, and for his resurrection he sheweth expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer. It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporall restitution: the first words *I also know*, denote a certainty and community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it, and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity; *I know* certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this *I also know*. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the Redeemer, sheweth that he understands it of Christ; the time expressed denotes the futurity at the latter day; the description of that Redeemer, standing on the earth, representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead; and, seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the Incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails onely in this, that they will not see in this place the promised Messias; from whence this future happy condition, which they allow, would clearly involve a Resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledge the words of Daniel to declare as much, *and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion.*

If these and other places of the old Testament shew that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead, we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. Christ, who called himself *the Resurrection and the life*, refuted the Sadduces, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the Law of Moses, and made it an Argument to prove as much, *As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living.* With the force of which Argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadduces silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had not received the promises

which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life in which they may receive it. So that the Argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jews have drawn from another place of Moses, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name of Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my Covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers.* It is not said, to give their sons, but, to give them the land of Canaan; and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoy'd it not, they must live again that they may receive the promise.

And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadduces out of the Law of Moses, so did S. Paul joyn himself unto the Pharisees in this particular, for being called before the Council, and perceiving that the one party were Sadduces and the other Pharisees, one denying, the other asserting the resurrection, *a he cryed unto the Council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question;* and answering before Felix, that they had found no evil doing in him, while he stood before the Council he mentioned this particularly, *b except it be for this one vice, that I cryed standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day.*

It is evident therefore that the Resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses chair did collect it thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world, that the Sadduces who denyed it, *erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God:* that our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it out of the Law of Moses, refuted the Sadduces, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the Apostles, who followed him confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the raising the dead was made known unto the Sons of men; and because God can doe whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a Resurrection by virtue of a clear Revelation.

Beside God hath not onely foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God heard the voice of Eliah for the dead child of the widdow of Sarepta, *and the soul of the child came in to him again, and he revived.* Him did Elisha succeed, not onely in the same spirit, but also in the like power, for he raised the child of the Shunamite from death; nor did that power dye together with him; for when they were burying a dead man, *they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet.* These three examples were so many confirmations, under the Law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we have three to equall under the Gospel. When the daughter of Jairus was dead, *Christ said unto her, Talitha cumi, Damsel arise, and her spirit came again, and straitway the Damsel arose.* When he came nigh to the gate of the city called Naim, *there was a dead man carried out, and he came nigh, and touched the bier, and said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise;* and he that was dead sat up and began to speak. Thus Christ raised the dead in the chamber and in the street, from the bed and

Exod. 6. 4.

לחית לכם לא
ואמר אליהם
בכאן להחיה
המתים מן התורה
It is not said
to give you,
but to give
them, where-
by the Resur-
rection of the
dead appea-
reth out of
the Law, R.
Simai in Pereh
Helek. And
therefore the
Jews hold the
resurrection for
one of the founda-
tions of the
law of Moses,

והחיות המתים
קאמר מן קאמר
כדעור משם
Moses Maim.
Expl. cap. 10.
Traet. Sanc-
drin.

a Acts 23. 6.
b Acts 14. 21.

1 King. 17. 22.

2 King. 4.

2 King 17. 21

Mark 5. 41. 42

Luke 8. 55.

Luke 7. 12.

14. 15.

from the bier, and not content with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also from the grave. When Lazarus had been *dead four dayes*, and so buried that his sister said of him, *by this time he stinketh*, *Jesus cryed with a loud voice; Lazarus come forth, and he that was dead came forth.* These three Evangelicall resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and generall Resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of the Resurrection of him who raised these.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actuall testimony of the Resurrection. For if *Christ be preached that he rose from the dead*, saith S. Paul to the Corinthians, *how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead?* If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that Christ did, then it must be as certainly false to asserit that there is no resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confesse that some particular persons did return † to life after death, they could not rationally deny the Resurrection wholly. Now the resurrection of Christ doth not onely prove by way of Example, as the rest who rose, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future generall Resurrection. For God hath ^a appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because Christ is risen. ^aAnd ^bsince by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all dye, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

This consequence of a future Resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a generall or a particular consideration. In a generall reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the Elect alone. First, it belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that Dominion of which Christ at his resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. *For to this end Christ both dyed and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* Now as *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living*, so Christ is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them, and rule them when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion entred upon at his Resurrection, *he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet*, and *the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death*, and there is no destruction of death but by a generall Resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to S. John, *I am he that live: and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keyes of hell and of death.* Thus are we assured of a generall Resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly, Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a Generall Resurrection in respect of the Judgement which is to follow. For as it is appointed for all men once to dye, so after death cometh judgement; and as Christ was raised that he might be judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As therefore God gave an assurance to all men that he would judge the world by that man, in that he raised him from the dead, so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the third resurrection of the world to judgement.

Now as the Generall Resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more especiall and peculiar manner the Resurrection of the chosen Saints and servants of God is demonstred thereby. For he is risen not
onely

only as their Lord and judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body (for *he is the Head of the body the Church, who is the beginning the first-born from the dead;*) as the *first-fruits*, by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted, for *now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept.* The Saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost; now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the resurrection of a Christian. For if *the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us.*

Coloss. 1.18.

1 Cor. 15. 20.

Rom. 8.11.

Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actuall raising of severall persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the Resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that *the Resurrection of the body*, is in it self considered possible, upon generall considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

But as it is necessary to a Resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man, so it is also necessary that the same flesh should be raised again; for if either the same body should be joyned to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviours testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entered into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other soules. If the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they doe, and when the Resurrection should be perform'd, the bodies should be inform'd with other soules; neither they who liv'd before then should revive, and those who live after the resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propogation but a renovation, not a production of new soules, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same soules should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this only true of our soules, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose bodie it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the Resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which dyed, that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day, that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again, that the same temple which was destroyed shall be re-built, is most apparent out of the same Word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any Resurrection. *Though after my skin wormes destroy this body, saith Job, yet in my flesh, (in flesh, shewing the reality, in my flesh, shewing the propriety and identity) shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another,*

Job 19. 26, 27.

Quid hac prophetia manifestius? nulus tam aperte post Christum, quam iste ante Christum de resurrectione loquitur. S. Hieron. Epist. 61.

dyed but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

Again, the description of the place from whence the Resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which *sleep in the dust of the earth*, they which *are in the graves* shall hear the voice and rise: *the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them.* But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive; if God should give us any other bodies then our own, neither the sea nor the grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the grave gives up; the grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which is buried at the last day shall be revived.

The immediate consequent of the Resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body, *We must all appear before the Judge.* *ment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad.* That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body; that which shall receive the reward, and be lyable to the punishment, is not onely the soul but the body; it stands not therefore with the nature of a .^c. just retribution, that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another, he which pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall ^a *destroy both their soul and body in hell*: but they which ^b *glorifie God in their body and their spirit, which are God's*, shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit, for they are both *bought with the same price*, even the blood of Christ. The bodies of the Saints are the ^c *members of Christ*, and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroy'd they shall be raised again. For if *the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us*, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, *a he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.*

Furthermore, the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never dye. This may be considered not onely in the .^c. Translations of Enoch and Elias, but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change; *the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord.* If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, onely changed into glorified and spirituall bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; cer-

Dan. 12. 2.
Iohn 5. 28.
Rev. 20. 13.

.^c. Quam absurdum, quam vero & iniquum, utrumque autem quam Deo indignum, aliam substantiam operari, aliam mercede dignari, ut hec quidem caro per martyria laetetur, alia vero coronetur: item & contrario hec quidem caro in spurcitiis volutetur, alia vero damnetur? Nonne prestat omnem semel fidem a spe Resurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque iustitia Dei ludere, Mar-

cionem pro Valentino resuscitari? Tertull. de Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 56. And speaking to the soul of man, Affirmamus te manere post vitæ disunctionem, & expectare diem iudicii, proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam ejusdemque hominis materiam & memoriam reverfuram, quod & nihil mali & boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate, & nulla ratio sit iudicii sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit iudicii passionem. Id. de Testim. Anime, cap. 4. a Matth. 10. 28. b 1 Corinth. 6. 20. c 1 Cor. 6. 15, 19. d Rom. 8. 11. .^c. Enoch translatus est in carne, Elias carneus raptus est in cælum, necdum mortui, & paradisi jam coloni habent quoque membra quibus rapti sunt atque translati, S. Hieron. Epist. 61. e 1 Thes. 4. 16, 17.

tainly those which were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the *Judge of the quick and the dead*. Otherwise the Saints which shall be with God and with the Lamb for evermore would be checkerd with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

Lastly, those examples which God hath been pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the Resurrection, do at the same time perswade us that the same body which dyed shall rise again. For, whether we look upon the three Examples of the Old Testament, or those of the New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death; it is written, that *the graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept awoke, and came out of their graves*, certainly the same bodies which were layed in. If then they were to us * examples of the Resurrection to come, as certainly they were, then must they resemble in their substance after they liv'd again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And being Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, *a Destroy this Temple and in three dayes I will raise it up*, and declared it to be his own body, saying, *b Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself*, being *c he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body*, it followeth that we shall rise in the same bodies † as our Saviour did, that every particular person at the Resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, *Behold it is I myself*.

Wee can therefore no otherwise expound this Article, teaching the *Resurrection of the body*, then by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever. alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition, not of their substance, but of their qualities. Which explication is most agreeable to the language of the Scriptures, to the Principles of Religion, to the constant Profession of the Church, against the Origenists of old, and the Socinians of late.

Having hitherto proved the Certainty of this Article, that there shall be a *Resurrection*, and declared the Verity and Propriety of it, that it shall be the *Resurrection* of the same body which was dead; we may now proceed further to enquire into the Latitude of the same, to whom the Resurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the Revelation of this truth under the Law and under the Gospel; Christ proved out of the Law that there should be lummodo infirmum; ne aliter documenta præmisisse quam rem disposuisse videatur, imo ne si exemplum resurrectionis sine carne non valuit inducere, multo magis plenitudinem exempli in eadem substantia exhibere non possit. Nullum vero exemplum majus est eo cujus exemplum est. Majus est autem si animæ cum corpore resuscitabuntur in documentum sine corpore resurgendi, ut tota hominis salus dimidiæ patrocineretur; quando exemplorum conditio istud potius expeteret quod minus haberetur, animæ dico solius resurrectionem, velut gustum carnis resurrectionis suo in tempore, *Ibid.* a *Iohn* 2. 19. b *Luke* 24. 39. c *Phil.* 3. 21. † Expectamus in hujus morte & sanguine emundatos remissionem peccatorum consecuturos: resuscitandos nos ab eo in his corporibus, & in eadem carne qua nunc sumus, sicut & ipse in eadem carne qua natus & passus & mortuus est resurrexit. So we read in the Creed which by some is attributed to Athanasius, by others to Gregory Nazianzene. Si ad exemplum Christi resurgamus qui resurrexit in carne, jam non ad exemplum Christi resurgemus si non in carne & ipsi resurgemus. Hæc est vera resurrectionis confessio quæ sic gloriam carni tribuit ut non auferat veritatem, S. Hieron, *Epist.* 61.

a Re-

a Resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no further then unto the people of God, because it is grounded upon those words, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*. Job speaketh most expressly of the Resurrection, but mentioneth no other then his Redeemer and himself. The place of Daniel, which was alwayes accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*. From whence the Jews most generally have believed that some men should live again and some should not, because it is written, *Many shall awake*, but it is not written, *All shall awake*. Nay some of them have gone so far by way of restriction, that they have maintained a resurrection of the just alone, according to that ancient saying accepted amongst them, that the *·.· Sending of the Rain is of the just and unjust, but the Resurrection of the dead is of the just alone*. Against which two Restrictions by the light delivered in the Gospel we shall deliver the latitude of this Article in these two Propositions. First, The Resurrection of the dead belongeth not unto the just alone, but to the unjust also. Secondly, The Resurrection of the dead belongeth not onely to some of the just, but to all the just, not to some of the unjust onely, but to all the unjust, even unto all the dead.

For the first, it is most evident, not onely out of the New, but also out of the Old Testament. The words of Daniel prove it sufficiently; for of those *many which shall awake, some shall rise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt*. But it is most certain that the just shall never rise to *shame and everlasting contempt*; therefore it is most evident that some shall awake and rise beside the just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by S. Paul's Apology to Felix, *But this I confesse unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust*. The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment; the first unto a Resurrection, called in reference unto them, *the Resurrection of life*; the second unto a Resurrection, named in relation unto them, *the Resurrection of damnation*. For as there is † a Resurrection of the just, so there must also be a Resurrection of the unjust: that as Christ said unto the charitable person, *Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just*; so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, *thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the Resurrection of the unjust*. For there shall be a Resurrection that there may be a Judgement, and at the Judgement there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of man, and goats on the left; therefore they both shall rise; those, that they may receive that blessing, *Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; these, that they may receive that sentence, *Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his Angels*. At that Resurrection then which we believe there shall rise both just and unjust.

Secondly, as no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded: whosoever dyeth is numbred with the just or unjust. Adam the first of men shall rise, and all which come from him. *For as in Adam all dyed, so in Christ shall all be made alive*. Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called

·.· This is recorded in the Bereshit Rabba. Vide Maimonides Expt. 10. c. Tract. Sanhedrin.

Acts 24. 15.

John 5. 29.
Ἀνάστασις ζωῆς
ἢ Ἀνάστασις
κρίσεως. The
first is called
ἀνάστασις
ζωῆς, & therefore
the second
may as well be
called ἀνάστασις
κρίσεως.
† Luke 14. 14.

Matth. 25. 34.

41.

1 Cor. 15. 22.

21.

John 5. 28.

Matth. 25. 32.

Rom. 14. 10.

2 Cor. 5. 10.

2 Tim. 2. 18.

Nonnulli attendentes verba que assidue dicit Apostolus, *Quia & mortui sumus cum Christo, & resurreximus cum eo*; nec intelligentes quatenus dicatur, arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem, nec ullam ulterius in fine temporis esse sperandam.

Ex quibus est, inquit, Hymeneus & Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resur-

rectionem jam factam esse. Idem Apostolus eos arguens detestatur, qui tamen dicit nos resurrexisse cum Christo, *S. Aug. Epist. 119. ad Ianuarium. This was the Heresy of the Seleuciani or Hermiani, as the same S. Aug. testifies, Her. 59. Resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum. Thus Tertullian relates of some Hereticks in his time, who made the Resurrection wholly Allegoricall, and yet pretended to believe a Resurrection in the flesh, but understood it in this life, at the Baptismall renovation, and so past when they professed to believe. Exinde ergo Resurrectionem fide consecutos cum Domino esse, cum eum in Baptismate induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis sæpe nostros decipere consueverunt, quasi & ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquit, qui non in hac carne resurrexit, ne statim illos percutiant, si resurrectionem statim abauerint; tacite autem secundum conscientiam suam hoc sentiunt. Væ qui non, dum in hac carne est, cognoverit arcana hæretica, hoc enim apud illos resurrectio, Tertull. de Resurrect. Carnis, cap. 19. a Iohn 11. 24. b Iohn 6. 39. c Matth 13. 39. d 1 Cor. 15. 52. e 1 Thess. 4. 16. f Act. 17. 31. Iohn 5. 28.*

led the Resurrection of the dead indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. By man came death, by man came the Resurrection of the dead, and so the Resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall destroy death, but if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are expresse and full, *The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of damnation.* In the description of the Judgement which followeth upon the Resurrection, *when the Son of man shall sit upon the Throne of his glory, it is said that, before him shall be gathered all nations. We shall all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ, and if so, the dead must all rise, for they all are fallen. We must all appear before the Judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil; and before we all appear the dead must rise that they may appear.* This is the latitude of the Resurrection; the Resurrection of the dead is the Resurrection of all the dead.

Now this Resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futuration of it. There were Hereticks in the Apostles dayes who acknowledged a Resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation of it to the time, as Hymeneus and Philetus, *who erred concerning the truth, saying that the Resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some.* To believe it already past is to deny it, because it cannot be believed past, but by such an interpretation as must destroy it. As they which interpret this Resurrection of the likenesse of Christ's Resurrection; that as he dyed and rose again, so we should dye unto sin and live again unto righteousness, attributing all to the renovation of the mind, must deny the resurrection of the body.

Now as we know the doctrine of the Resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come; so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the world; because, as Martha called it, it is the *a Resurrection at the last day.* Job who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the *last day*; Christ hath no otherwise declared his *Fathers will*, then that *b of all which he hath given him, he should loose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.* The corn is sown and laid in the ground, and *c the harvest is the end of the world.* We must not expect to rise from the dead till *d the last trump.* *e The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an Archangel & with the trump of God before all that are in the graves shall hear his voice. God shall f judge the world, and*

there-

therefore shall raise the world: but he will not raise them to that judgement till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a Resurrection; that the Resurrection which was revealed is the Resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead or shall hereafter dye; that this Resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this Article.

The Value of this Truth, the Necessity of this doctrine will appear; First, in the illustration of the Glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his Wisdome, Power, Justice, and Mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the Resurrection is as it were a new Creation. The Wisdome and Power of God are manifested in this acknowledgement, in as much as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individuall dufts of all the bodies of all men; and without an infinite power he could not conjoyn, cement, conglutinate and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The Mercy and Justice of God are declared by the same profession; the Mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved, the Justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient with everlasting flames. *When ye see this, saith the Prophet, your hearts shall rejoyce, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies.* Isai. 66. 14.

Secondly, it is necessary to professe the believe of the Resurrection of the body, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerfull work of our Redemption: confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life had not the Saviour of the world abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. If Christ were not the Life, the dead could never live: if he were not the Resurrection they could never rise. Were it not for him that liveth and was dead and is alive for evermore, had not he the keys of hell and of death, we could never break through the barres of death; or passe the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our last enemy to be destroyed is death: that the prophesie may be fulfilled, *Death is swallowed up in victory*, and we may cry out with the Apostle, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* 2 Tim. 1. 10.
Hos. 13. 14.
1 Cor. 15. 54.
57.

Thirdly, the Believe of this Article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death passed upon us for our sins cannot but affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the Resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature upon the comforts proceeding from our faith. The departure of our friends might overwhelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the Apostle will not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope. 1 Thes. 4. 13.

Fourthly, the belief of the Resurrection hath a necessary reflection

Acts 24. 15.
16.

1 Cor. 15. 58.

xion upon this life by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the Judgement seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternall rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter except it here become the Temple of the Holy Ghost? S. Paul who hath delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. *I have hope, saith he, towards God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein doe I exercise my self to have alwayes a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.* This is the proper work of a true belief and a full perswasion of a resurrection; and he which is really possessed with this hope, cannot chuse but purifie himself; *alwayes abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knoweth that his labour is not in vain in the Lord.* This encourageth all drooping spirits, this sustaineth all fainting hearts, this sweetneth all present miseries, this lightneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities.

Having thus discovered the truth of this Article; we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to professe, when he confesseth a belief of *the Resurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I am fully periwaded of this as of a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to dye, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death, that the soules separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves and reunited to their souls, that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, that the same numericall bodies which did fall shall rise, that this resurrection shall be universall, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave, that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation, that this shall be performed at the last day when the Trump shall sound; and thus *I believe the Resurrection of the body.*

ARTICLE XII.

And the Life Everlasting.

THis last Article though † not to be found in all, yet was express'd in * many ancient Creeds: in some by way of addition, and the life everlasting; in others by way of conjunction with the former, the Resurrection of the body unto everlasting life. Upon this conjunction with the former will follow the true Interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we are perswaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the Resurrection in the world to come.

As therefore S. Paul hath taught us to expresse our belief of a Resurrection both of the just and unjust, so after the Resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both, of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt, and so those who first acknowledged this Article † did interpret it. Although therefore *Life everlasting*, as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise then as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord, yet the same words may be used to expresse the duration of any persons which live never to dye again, whatsoever their state and condition in it selfe shall be. For as the *Resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternall condition which followeth after it, as when the Apostle saith, . *If by any means I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead*; which he must needs be most

† Not in all; for divers ended with that of the Resurrection, as appeareth by Rufinus, who not onely expounded the Aquileian Creed, but collated it with the Greek and Roman, and yet makes no mention of this Article, but concludes with that of the Resurrection. Sed & ultimus iste sermo, qui resurrectionem carnis pronunciat, summam totius perfectionis succincta bre-

vitae concludit. And whereas he shews the custome of the Aquileian Church to make a crosse upon their forehead at the naming of hujus carnis, he tells us elsewhere, in his *Apology* against S. Hierome, that it was to conclude the Creed. Quo scilicet frontem, ut mos est in fine Symboli, signaculo contingentes, & ore carnis hujus, videlicet quam contingimus, resurrectionem fatentes, omnem venenatam adversum nos linguæ calumniandi aditum præstruimus. In the same manner S. Hierome his contemporary, In Symbolo fidei & spei nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum non scribitur in charta & atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem Trinitatis & Unitatem Ecclesiæ omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur, Epist. 61. So Maximus Taurinensis after those words Carnis resurrectionem, adds, Hic Religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est. And Venantius Fortunatus after the same words, summa perfectionis concluditur. And in the Ms. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh Caputis avastatū and carnis resurrectione are the last words. * As Petrus Chrysologus expressly, Credimus vitam æternam, quia post resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est nec malorum. Signate vos, Serm. 60. and again, Bene addidit vitam æternam, ut se resurrecturum crederet qui resurget per ipsum qui cum Deo Patre & Spiritu S. vivat & regnat. So Etherius Examensis, & Eusebius Gallicanus. So we find Serm. de Tempore 131. & De Symbolo ad Catech. lib. 1. Quomodo carnis Resurrectionem? Ne forte putet aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic esse, additum est in vitam æternam; and l. 2. Hoc sequitur etiam in S. Symbolo, quod post Resurrectionem carnis credamus & vitam æternam; lib. 3. and lib. 4. Hoc sequitur in S. Symbolo quod omnia quæ credimus & speramus in Vita æterna percipiamus. And Carolus Magnus in his reprehension of Basilii Bishop of Ancyra. Non eo modo præjudicat prætermisso imaginum adorationis sacræ fidei puritati, quæ interdicta potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicant Remissio peccatorum, carnis Resurrectio, & Vita futuri sæculi, si in confessione prætermittantur; quæ utique & in omni scripturarum serie prædicantur, & ab Apostolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, Cyprian. lib. 3. c. 6. † As appeareth by those words of Chrysologus, Credimus vitam æternam, quia post Resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est nec malorum. . . Phil. 3. 11. Though in this place it is not barely avastatū, but ἡ ἀνάστασις, eis miv ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ ἀνάστασις, and in the Alexandrian Ms. eis miv ἡ ἀνάστασις miv ἐκ νεκρῶν, which is the most ancient reading, as appeareth by the Vulgar Translation, Si modo occurrat in Resurrectionem quæ est ex mortuis, and the reading of Tertullian, Si qua concurrem in Resurrectionem quæ est à mortuis, and the Syriack Translation, ἡ ἀνάστασις, yet the ἡ ἀνάστασις of it self, was taken for no more then avastatū by any of the Translators. And S. Chrysostome did so understand it, as appeareth by these words upon the place, Εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἡ ἀνάστασις, eis miv ἡ ἀνάστασις miv ἐκ νεκρῶν (which is the reading of the Alexandrian Ms.) ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἡ ἀνάστασις, certain

Hb h

certain

αὐτὸς τυγχάνει, καὶ ἐκ ἀναστάσεως μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφ' ὅσων πάντες, οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλαι, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν νεωτέρων. Εἰ
 ταῖναι πάντες τῆς ἀναστάσεως τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀναστάσεως μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφ' ὅσων πάντες, πῶς οὖν πολλὰν ἐξαίρετον πρὸς
 τυγχάνειν ἔδειξε, εἴπως κατανύσσου; By which it appeareth that S. Chrysostome took no notice of the word
 ἐξαίρετος, or of the phrase ἡ ἐκ τῶν νεωτέρων, but as the interpretation of the Apostles intention addeth, πολλὰν ἐξαίρετον
 ἀναστάντων; τὴν ποιεῖ αὐτὸν ἀγαστὴν τὸν Χριστόν. So also Theodoret's paraphrase, ἵνα μακάριον καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.
 It is therefore I conceive a Notion peculiar to Theophylact among the Greeks, Πάντες ἀνίστανται, ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ πάντων
 ἱεραίσταται.

certain to attain unto, who believed the Resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the Resurrection in generall, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, *If by any means*, nor that which went before, *the fellowship of Christs sufferings*, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead; but he meant that Resurrection which followeth upon the being *made conformable unto his death*, which is a Resurrection in conformity to the Resurrection of Christ. As, I say, the *Resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scripture for everlasting happinesse, and yet the same language is and may be used for the generall resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; so the *Life everlasting*, though used for a Reward given onely unto the Elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the Reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the resurrection live by a true vital union of their souls unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be dissolved, because it is *appointed for men once to dye*, and after their reviviscency never to dye again, it followeth that the life which they shall live, must be an *everlasting life*.

To begin then with the Resurrection to condemnation; the Truth included in this Article in reference unto that, is to this effect, that those who dye in their sins and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the Judgement seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergoe the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two wayes this Eternity may be denied; one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the torments must likewise cease; the other, by a suspension or relaxion of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelations of the Justice of God against the disobedience of man.

Our first Assertion therefore is, that the Wicked after the day of Judgement shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They who of late oppose the eternall subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their Opinion not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the * Heathens did, but as a truth delivered in the Scriptures, as if the Word it self taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment; as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing Atheist expects, that is, after death never to be again, or if they be, as it were in a moment to loose that being for ever. Because the Scripture speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and

dye;

* Μαχέονται
 δὲ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν
 ἀποδείξουσιν ὅτι
 αἱ ψαῖδες, ἡμεῖς
 πάντες τὸ ἀπορῶν
 θνήσκουσιν.
 S. Empiricus
 adv. Mathem.
 p. 321.

dye; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in Hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there, In this sense will they understand those words of Christ, (so full of terrour in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked, in their exposition,) *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition onely, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition onely excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost, and dead, who is rejected, separated and disjoyned from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vitall union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergoe the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases or expressions give any comfort to the wicked, or strength to this Opinion, if the same Scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and dye, say also that they shall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently doc.

Depart from me ye cursed, shall the Judge eternall say to all the Reprobate, *into everlasting fire;* and least any should imagine that the fire shall be eternall, but the torments not; it followeth, *and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the Reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the Reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Nay the *life eternal* may as well be affirmed to have an end, as the *everlasting punishment*, because they are both delivered in the same expression.

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question onely can be what that eternity doth signifie. For, because some things are called in the Scriptures eternall which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternall, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the Fire is termed eternall, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, precluding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished can never end; but such is the fire which shall torment the Reprobate; for he, whose *fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;* and hath taught us before, that *it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to goe into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched;* and hath further yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and

affirmant peccatorum supplicia finienda. Sunt enim nunc etiam qui idcirco peccatis suis ponere finem negligunt, quia habere quandoque finem futura super se judicia suspicantur. Quibus breviter respondemus, si quandoque finienda sunt supplicia reprobatorum, quandoque finienda sunt & gaudia beatorum: per semetipsam enim Veritas dicit, *Ibunt hi in supplicium aeternum, iusti autem in vitam aeternam.* Si igitur hoc verum non est, quod minatus est, neque est illud verum quod promissit. S. Gregor. Moral. lib. 34. cap. 11. b Matth. 3. 12. Luke 3. 17. c Matth. 18. 8.

Matth. 9. 43. 44.

Matth. 10. 28

Locus Matth. 10. 28.

perditionem tantum animæ in gehenna, non cruciatu denunciat, Smalcus contra Meisnerum. Igitur æterno illi

Christi hostes, qui quidem sunt Diabolus & Angeli ejus (vel saltem quorum nomine isti quoque continentur) cum impiis cruciabantur, & ita delebuntur: Crellius Comm. in.

I Cor. c. 15.

a Matth. 25.

41. 46.

1 Καὶ ὁ ἀποκρίσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπεν λέγων αὐτῷ, οὐδὲν δύναμις εἰς ζῆν αὐτῶν.

Matth. 25. 46.

Antiquus ille Persuasor in membris suis, id est, in mentibus iniquorum futuras poenas quasi certo fine determinat, ut eorum correptiones extendat, & eo magis hic peccata non finiant, qui istis

undeniable description of the place of torments, *Where the worm dyeth not, and the fire is not quenched.* And that we may be yet further assured that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that *the smoak of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever*, and that those which are *cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*: which inpression of *day and night* is the same with that which declareth the eternall happinesse in the heavens, where *They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy*: where *they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his Temple*. If then the fire in which the Reprobates are to be tormented be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched, that the smoak thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever, (all which the Scriptures expressly teach) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternall to the tormenting flames.

Neither doth this onely prove the eternity of infernall pains, but clearly refute the onely materiall Argument brought against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the Wicked after the Resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death, and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For, the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to dye the second death because they endure eternall torments. *He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the second death*; it seems that they which shall dye that death shall be hurt by it, whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtfull or injurious, but highly beneficiall to them. But the living torments are the second death. *For death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death. Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire*, this is the second death. The Jews before our Saviour's time believed there was a second death, and though it were not expressed in the Oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received \dagger Exposition of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and what this punishment shall be, was in these words revealed to S. John. *a But the fearfull and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers and whoremongers and sorcerers and Idolaters, and all lyars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.* Now if the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetuall permanfion in torment, as before is proved; then to say that the wicked shall dye the second death is not a confutation of their eternall being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments, but delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or inferre a conclusion of torment, much lesse will the bare phrafses of *perdition* and *destruction*; for we may as well conclude that whosoever sayes he is *done*, *perii*.

\dagger The Chaldee Paraphrase maketh often mention of it, as Deut. 33. 6. Let Ruben live and not dye, he expoundeth thus. יחי ראובן בחי עולם ומחיה תניח לא ימות. Let Ruben live in life of the World, and not dye the second death. So the

Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targum more expressly, יחי ראובן בעולם הרין ולא ימות במותא תניח רבא. Let Ruben live in this world, and let him not dye the second death, which the wicked dye in the world to come. So Esai. 22. 14. Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye dye. אמ ישהב חכא הרין לבן עד די תמותון מותא תניח. I will not keep silence but will recompense, even recompense into their bosome. לא אתן להן ארכא בחייא אלהן אשלם להן פורענות חובה. I will not give them an end in this life, but will recompense them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to the second death. From these and the like places it appeareth that the Jews believed that the wicked after death should be delivered to a second death; that this death should be in the world to come; that they should by this death be punished for their sins, as S. John revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings. a Revel. 21. 8. *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι.

done,

done, intends thereby that he shall be no more: beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the Scripture signifies a perpetual perdition and duration in misery. For when Christ shall come to *take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.* Wherefore I conclude that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first Assertion, against the * covert Doctrine of the Socinian.

2 Thes. i. 8, 19.

The second Assertion teacheth us that as the Reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the Justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the dayes of refreshment who are cast into perpetuall burnings. One part of their misery is the horreur of despair, and it were not perfect Hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and Abraham's bosome, that none could passe from one to other; what impossibility must there be when the finall sentence is past upon all. As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none which is once cast into the fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels, shall ever enter into their Masters joy. As the tree falleth so it lyeth: there is no change to be wrought in man, within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath *delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father*, then shall the office of the Mediator cease.

* I call it covert, because it was at first closely delivered by Socinus, and some of his brethren did professe themselves to be scandalized at it, though he thought he had so delivered it that it should sooner be believed by his writings then perceived in them, as appeareth out of his sixth Ep. to Volkelius. Quod ais ea in Disputatione mea cum Puccio tum de Christianorum resurrectione tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quæ à multis sine magna offensione, tum nostris tum alienis, legi non possint, scio equidem ista ibi contineri, sed meo judicio, non passim nec ita aperte (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quisquam vir pius facile offendi possit; adeo

So groundlesse was the Opinion of Origen, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joyes of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such Regions of the World, as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that Christ shall be born and dye again, (who being risen *dieth not*) as that any person being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death, should ever come live again, and by believing in the death of Christ, to be after saved. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation irreversible, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternall. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first, so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second Assertion.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain and infallible doctrines in Christianity. That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the Justice of God revealed against all unrighteousnesse of men. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by Christ, and delivered up under the curse to be tormented

ut quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum mortem, in quo dogmate majus est multo offensionis periculum, ea potius ex iis colligi possit quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse literis consignata extet, adeo ut Lector, qui alioqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primi hominis, quæ toto libro agitur, quæque ob non paucos quos habet fautores, parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest probandum censeat, prius sentiat doctrinam istam sibi jam persuasam esse quam suaderi animadvertat.

with

with the Devil and his Angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits. That they shall be tormented with a pain of losse, the losse from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for loosing him. That they further shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of losse, because there is no hope of heaven, under an eternall pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the Athanasian Creed, *They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.*

The next Relation of this Article to the former is in reference to the Resurrection of the Just; and then *the life everlasting* is not to be taken † in a vulgar and ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of the Scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

† Eam quippe vitam eternam dicimus, ubi est sine fine felicitas. Nam si anima in pœnis vivit æternis, quibus & ipsi spiritus cruciuntur immundi, mors illa potius æterna dicenda est, quam vita. Nulla quippe major & pejor est mors quàm ubi non moritur mors. S. Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 6. c. 12. Quia vita eterna ab his qui familiaritatem non habent cum Scripturis Sanctis potest accipi etiam malorum vita; vel secundum quosdam etiam Philisophos, propter animæ immortalitatem; vel etiam secundum fidem nostram, propter pœnas interminabiles impiorum, qui utique in æternum cruciari non paterunt nisi etiam vixerint in æternum; profecto finis Civitatis hujus, in quo summum habebit bonum, vel pax in vita æterna, vel vita æterna in pace dicendus est, ut facilius ab omnibus possit intelligi. Idem l. 19. c. 11. a Ioh. 5. 24. b Phil. 1. 23. c 2 Cor. 5. 8.

Now this life eternall may be looked upon under three considerations; as Initiall, as Partiall, and as Perfectionall. I call that Eternall Life *Initiall*, which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow; of which our Saviour spake, *a He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.* I call that *Partiall*, which belongeth though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is the soul of the just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the joyes be partiall as to the soul, I am sure they are but partiall as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happinesse which is conferred on the Soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence, of God. S. Paul had a *b desire to depart and to be with Christ*; he was *willing rather to travaile & c be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord*: and certainly where S. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is, with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happinesse which the Saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *Partiall* life eternall. Thirdly, I call that *Perfectionall* which shall be conferred upon the Elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, *Come ye blessed children of my Father, Receive the Kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *Eternall* life is to be considered in the Possession, and in the Duration; in the first, as it is *Life*, in the second, as it is *Eternall*. Now this life is not onely naturall, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the Reprobate; but spirituall, which consisteth in the † union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speakes, *a He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an espe-

* Duæ vitæ sunt una corporis, altera animæ: sicut vita corporis anima, ita vita animæ Deus. Quomodo si anima deserat, moritur corpus; sic anima moritur, si deserat Deus. S. Aug. in Psal. 70. d I Ioh. 5. 12:

ciall manner *Life*, because of the * happinesse which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that life, is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happinesse doth consist.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; The bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection shall be transformed into spirituall and incorruptible bodies. The flesh ^a is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, sown in dishonour, raised in glory, sown in weaknesse, raised in power, sown a naturall body raised a spirituall body. This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, ^b who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Thus when we come into that other world, the world of Spirits, even our bodies shall be spirituall.

As for the better part of man, the soul, it shall be highly exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts or faculties thereof. The Understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. ^c Now we see through a glasse darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known. And this enen now ^d we know, that when God shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. Our first temptation was that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by Christ we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our Wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefective holinesse, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin. They shall be troubled with no doubtfull choice, but with their [†] radicall and fundamentall freedome shall fully embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected that we may be thereby made capable, and then happy by a full fruition.

To this internall perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedome from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God; an hereditary pos-

* For Life is taken for happinesse, and to live for being happy. As among the Greeks and Latines Ζῆν & Vivere were taken for living a cheerefull and a merry life, as Vivamus mea Lesbia, in callus, & in. Martial. Sera nimis vita est crastina, vive hodie, and as it is in an Old Inscription AMICIDUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS, and in the convivall wish, Ζῆτας, mentioned by Dio in the life of Commodus; So in the language of the Scriptures and a religious notion they signify an happy and a blessed life, as 1 Sam. 10.24. יְהִי מָלְכוֹ Let the king

live, is translated by the Chaldee Paraphrast, יְהִי מָלְכוֹ Let the king prosper. And when David sent unto Nabal, he said, Thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity, which is in the Originall nothing but מָלְכוֹ. So the Psalmist is to be understood, Psal. 69. 32. The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seeke God. And S. Paul 1 Thess. 3. 8. ὅτι οὐ μὲν ζῶμεν, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς ἐν ζωῇ. Thus Life of it self is often taken in the Scriptures for a happy and glorious life, even that which is eternall, as S. Austin observeth upon these words of the 119 Psalm. Veniant mihi miserationes tuae & vivam] Tunc enim vere vivam, quando nihil potero timere ne moriar. Ipsa enim & sine ullo additamento dicitur Vita, nec intelligitur nisi aeterna & beata, tanquam sola dicenda sit vita, in cujus comparatione ista quam ducimus, mors potius sit appellando quam vita: quale illud est in Evangelio, Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata. Nunquid addidit, aeternam vel beatam? Item de resurrectione carnis cum loqueretur, Qui benefecerunt, inquit, in resurrectionem vitam. Neque hic ait, aeternae vel beatę. Sic & hic, Veniant, inquit, mihi miserationes tuae, & vivam: neque hic ait, in aeternum vivam, vel, beate vivam; quasi aliud non sit vivere quam sine ullo fine, & sine ulla miseria vivere. Thus S. Austin, & again Enchir. ad Laurentium. c. 92. Non est vivera nisi ubi feliciter vivitur, nec vera incorruptio, nisi ubi talis nullo dolore corrumpitur. a 1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44. b Phil. 3. 21. c 1 Cor. 13. 12. d 1 Iohn 3. 2

† Sicut prima immortalitas fuit quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit non posse mori, ita primum liberum arbitrium, posse non peccare, novissimum non posse peccare. Sic enim erit inamissibilis voluntas pietatis & aequitatis quomodo est felicitatis. Nam utique peccando nec pietatem nec felicitatem tenuimus, voluntatem vero felicitatis nec perditam felicitate perdidimus. Certe Deus ipse numquid quia peccare non potest ideo liberum arbitrium habere negandus est? Erit ergo illius Civitatis & una in omnibus & inseparabilis in singulis voluntas libera, ab omni malo liberata, & impleta omni bono, fluens indeficenter aeternorum jocunditate gaudiorum, oblita culpae, oblita poenarum, nec tamen ideo suae liberationis oblita, ut liberatori suo non sit ingrata. S. Aug. de Civit. Dei. 22. c. 30.

Session

session of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God; This is the *Life*.

And now the *Duration* of this life is as necessary as the life it self, because to make all already mentioned amount unto a true felicity, there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it or being deprived of it. And this is added, to complete our happiness, by the adjection of Eternity. Now that this life shall be eternall we are assured who have not yet obtain'd it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchased it for us and promised it unto us, often calleth it *eternall life*; it is described as a *continuing city*, as *everlasting habitations*, as an *house eternall in the heavens*; it is expressed by *eternall glory*, *eternall salvation*, by an *eternall inheritance*, *incorruptible*, *undefiled*, and that *fadeth not away*, by the *everlasting kingdome of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. And least we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, *If any man keep my saying he shall never see death*. And, *whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not dye*. When God shall *wipe away all tears from our eyes there shall be no more death*; and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life. Which is expressed by S. Paul by way of opposition, calling it *life and immortality*, and that together with the abolition of death, saying that *our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*.

The belief of this Article is Necessary, (as to the eternity of torment,) to deterre us from committing sin, and to quicken us to a speedy repentance for sin committed. For, *the wages of sin is death*; nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm, who dyeth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but because he sinned and repented not.

Secondly, the belief of eternall pains after death is Necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his Justice, and the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that direction, to embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, *I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him*.

Thirdly, this belief is Necessary to teach us to make a fit estimate of the price of Christ's blood, to value sufficiently the work of our Redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ. For he which believeth not the eternity of torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankfull to his Redeemer by whose intervention we have escaped them. Whereas he who is sensible of the losse of heaven, and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the Devil and his Angels, the violence of the wrath of an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value the price of that blood, and be proportionably thankfull for so plenteous a Redemption.

Again, as this Article followeth upon the Resurrection of the just, and
con-

Heb. 13. 14.
Luke 16. 9.
2 Cor. 5. 1.
1 Pet. 5. 10.
Heb. 5. 9. 15
1 Pet. 1. 4.
2 Pet. 1. 11.
John 8. 51.
11. 26.
Rev. 21. 4.

2 Tim. 1. 10.

Luke 12. 5.

containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is Necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of the kingdom of heaven and that righteousness to which such a life is promised. *I will now turn aside, and see this great sight*, said Moses, when he saw the burning bush. *It is good for us to be here*, said S. Peter, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the Mount; how much more ought we to be enflamed with a desire of the joys of heaven, and that * length of dayes which onely satisfieth by its eternity, to a carefull and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised! For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him.

Secondly, this belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a † contempt of the world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; to a *set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth*, considering we *are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God*. For *where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also*. Therefore we must *forget those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, presse toward the mark, for the price of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus*.

Thirdly, an Assent unto this Truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the Crosse of Christ, and to support us under it; willingly and cheerfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, *reckoning with the Apostle, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us*; and knowing that *our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*: and this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except we *look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal*.

And now having thus shewed the propriety, proved the verity, and declared the necessity of this Article, we may fully instruct every Christian how to expresse his belief in the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce: I do fully and freely assent unto this as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust after their Resurrection and Condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall so be continued in torments for ever, so as neither the Justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them: and that the Just after their Resurrection and Absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the Inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their Masters joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe *the Life everlasting*.

tendatur avaritia vestra. Argentum vis sine fine? Vitam æternam desidera sine fine. Non vis ut habeat finem possessio tua? Vitam æternam desidera. † Nemo vitam æternam, incorruptibilem immortalemque desiderat, nisi eum vitam hujus temporalis, corruptibilis, mortalisque porneceat 8. Aug. Rom. 50. a Col. 3. 2, 3. b Matth. 6. 21. c Phil. 3. 13, 14. d Rom. 8. 18. e 2 Cor. 4. 17, 18.

* So S. Austin upon those words, Longitudine dierum replebo eum] in the 91. Psalm. Quæ est longitudo dierum? vita æterna est. Fratres, nolite putare longitudinem dierum dici, sicut sunt hyeme minores, æstate dies majores. Tales dies nobis habet dare? Longitudo illa est quæ non habet finem, æterna vita quæ nobis promittitur in diebus longis. Et vere quia sufficit non sine causa dixit, replebo eum. Non nobis sufficit quicquid longum est in tempore si habet finem, & ideo nec longum dicendum est. Et si avari sumus, vitam æternam debemus esse avari: talem vitam desiderate quæ non habet finem. Ecce ubi ex-

F I N I S.

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE